THE : FACT : OF : SIN

N : WALLACE : STROUP

Class 233.2 D Book St 89
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
PRESENTED BY
THE REV. W. W. BELLINGER

THE FACT OF SIN

THE FACT OF SIN

Viewed Historically and Doctrinally

By

REV. N. WALLACE STROUP, M. A.

Author of "The New Switzerland."

CINCINNATI: JENNINGS AND GRAHAM
NEW YORK: EATON AND MAINS

Copyright, 1908,
By Jennings and Graham

233.2
St89
108581

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	THE FOREWORD,	7
I.	THE FACT DEFINED,	13

Part I

THE FACT IN POETRY AND PHILOSOPHY

II.	IN POETRY,	27
III.	IN EVOLUTION,	71
IV.	IN PHILOSOPHY,	107

Part II

THE FACT IN HISTORY AND RELIGION

V.	IN THE ETHNIC FAITHS,	129
VI.	IN THE OLD TESTAMENT,	153
VII.	IN THE NEW TESTAMENT,	165

Part III

THE FACT IN THEOLOGY AND THOUGHT

VIII.	THE ORIGIN,	177
IX.	THE NATURE,	195
X.	THE CHARACTERISTICS,	209
XI.	THE TRANSMISSION,	229
XII.	THE RELATIONS,	247
XIII.	THE CONCLUSION,	291

FOREWORD

The subject of this book is one of the most important in theological thought. "The fact of sin" is interwoven in every discussion involving the doctrine of the salvation of men. It lies at the basis of both the Old and the New Testament teaching, and any system of Christian thought which excludes it from consideration is, to that extent at least, defective. Sin and redemption are the two great discussions around which the formulated thought of the centuries in relation to Christianity has gathered. It is ineradically interwoven in the Holy Scriptures, and any interpretation which excludes this great fact can not be accepted by the Christian theologian. The Old Testament abounds not only in the statement but in the illustration of sin. The words "sin" and "sinners" are frequent in the Scriptures.

There is no one of the sacred writers who has given sin more elaborate treatment than the Apostle Paul. Two remarkable passages at once attest this. One is Romans v, 12: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin: and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Again (1 Timothy i, 15) the apostle says, "It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." The statement of men as sinners is a distinct conception of the divine revelation. Error, wrong, disharmony with one's conditions, legal disobedience, a condition which is to be righted in some way, is found in a greater or less degree in all religious thought. But the conception of sin as a violation of God's law, as antagonism to God's holiness, as a condition requiring penalty from which there must be deliverance by divine power, is peculiar to Christian theology.

The obscuration of sin in these times is one of our most dangerous tendencies. Without this sense there is little room or need for

repentance and, consequently, for seeking deliverance. It has ceased to be talked about and is rarely preached about. Sin lies in the nature of man and also in the acts of man. Men commit sins because men are sinners. As a nature it is a tendency, as an act it is a transgression. As a nature it is a depravity, and as an act it is guilt. Both, according to the Chistian conception, need the divine atonement and divine rescue.

This book is one that should command attention both because of its subject and because of its treatment. The author has mastered the literature on the subject and has entered into its deep meaning and recognized the vital relation of the fact of sin to the divine plan of salvation. The unbiblical conceptions of the origin of sin are clearly stated and the Biblical position defended. Poetry, Science, Philosophy, and the Scriptures are freely drawn upon for illustration. Over against the fact of sin the author places the fact of holiness and unfolds the transition of the human soul from sin to holiness through the faith of Jesus Christ.

To many minds it will be a new revelation of the exceeding sinfulness of sin and an inspiration to turn to God for deliverance. The clearness of style, thoroughness of discussion, and the importance of the subject commend this book as worthy of attention and study on the part both of the Christian layman and the Christian minister. We cordially commend it as a timely and valuable contribution to an essential doctrine of the Holy Scriptures too much neglected in our time. In its careful study the reader will find intellectual illumination and spiritual uplifting.

PRESIDENT HENRY A. BUTTZ, D. D., LL. D.

Drew Theological Seminary,
Madison, N. J.

I

THE FACT DEFINED

"The right knowledge of sin is of supreme importance."

—Calvin.

"Every-day experience teaches us that the right knowledge of sin is as rare as it is difficult."

—Van Oosterzee.

"All the religions of the world recognize the sinfulness of man. Even the Hindus, whose teachers tell us that there is no sin, teach the doctrine of transmigration, or that the result of wrong-doing in this world is condemnation to endless cycles of suffering in lower forms of existence."

—Amory H. Bradford.

THE FACT DEFINED

The purpose of the following pages is twofold: first, we desire to present a short review of the Fact of Sin as it has existed in the thought of the leading men and systems of the centuries, and, secondly, that we may recover to the fact the emphasis which is demanded in our message to the modern mind. We can not fail to know that the need of the hour is a vivid conception of the potency and reality of sin. Gladstone voiced the true expression of every Christian heart when he said that—

"The great want in modern life is a deep sense of sin; it is wanting in our sermons, wanting everywhere. Sin can neither be denied nor accounted unreal. There is nothing which at the present time needs more to be insisted on in theology and in gospel preaching than the objectivity and reality of guilt. It is not a subjective illusion, which we should be taught to disregard in view of God's in-

finite love; it is as real as life or death, a gigantic problem for God and man."

We are living in that which has been termed an age of doubt. It is an era of materialism and theological unrest. Socialism is invading the common mind. Philanthropy has sought to usurp the place of Christianity, but the displacement is only apparent. That which is inherently dependent can not long exist independently. Christianity is the eternal source of philanthropy and charity. Love of humanity is born of love to God. Sin is still persistently present and man needs redemption. There can be no relief in disregard or denial. The disease must be dealt with from within as well as from without.

There must be a regeneration of the nation as well as of the individual before we shall realize the fulfillment of the prophetic prayer which foretold the hour when the perfect will of a perfect reigning One should be done on earth as in heaven.

The fact of sin has to do with the whole of life—with what *we are* as well as what

we do. The inner condition is causal to the outward action. In Christian thought the fact of sin and the fact of Christ are intimately related. There is a sense in which it may be said that the entrance of sin was causal to the Incarnation of the Christ. It is divinely true that in a moral world governed by a personal Providence, the needs arising from the grant of human sovereignty are certain to be met by the wisdom and love of the Infinite Father. The same love that expressed itself in the creation of man as a free moral agent, would not fail to make the necessary sacrifice to redeem the individual, when through an act of disobedience he had betrayed the trust of moral freedom. But we must not forget that love has its limitations and that divine holiness must be just.

The fact of sin determines not only our conception of man but also of God. A wrong idea of the nature of evil always produces a false notion of both humanity and Deity. The various systems of philosophy and theology have been grouped about two widely divergent views of sin—the one has been

wholly Christian, while the other has been largely naturalistic. The one is the child of divine revelation, while the other is purely of human origin. The former has always proved effectual in individual emancipation, while the latter has tended to lessen the sense of guilt and the consequent necessity of seeking regeneration and purification. If we are to be successful in our advance toward a higher plane of social, political, and spiritual living, we must not fail to give a large place to the fact of sin.

We find several witnesses to the reality of sin aside from that of our own personal consciousness. They vary in their understanding and grasp of the subject, but they are all of value in our approach toward a more perfect conception of the fact. The first evidence is that which we gain from the inspired genius of the poet, and, though not of the highest value, it is still of entrancing interest to every lover of literature. Poetry preceded prose in the formation of literature. Philosophy, like poetry, is often unable to appreciate the full meaning of that

which the New Testament portrays in the inspired word of spiritual wisdom. The same may be said of the ethnic faiths, since they have been deprived of the higher revelation of Scripture. But in all these systems which form a sort of preliminary preparation to the complete Christian conception of sin, we have a partially revealed moral code, which is prophetic of that which came in the fullness of time through Him whose coming made sin exceedingly sinful.

God selected one nation through which He presented a concrete example of His plans and purposes, and divinely chosen men spoke in divers manners as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; yet all nations and people have been imperfectly seeking to reveal an inner ideal which had been divinely implanted and may be said to have been primal.

The harmony of the existence of evil and the theistic conception of the world has ever been the enigma of Science. The philosopher has attempted to ratify reason, and the Christian has sought to satisfy conscience. That sin exists is no longer a debatable ques-

tion, but its right to exist has always been seriously questioned. The atheist denies it by shutting out God. The philosopher annuls it by making it a necessity. The poet bemoans its "frightful mien," yet refers it to God. The evolutionist locates it in matter, making it a mere infirmity.

Man's estimate of sin determines to a large degree man's conception of God. National history is little more than a concrete portrayal of man in relation to good and evil, showing how the divine purpose is being wrought out under human freedom and Providence. The moral and spiritual advancement of mankind has been attained, not by any positive aid of the forces of sin, but rather in spite of all its opposition.

The great need of the hour is a vision of sin in all its deep and direful relations to the individual and to the Infinite. When the sense of sin waned and weakened, and indulgences were being sold in the street with a priestly promise of absolution for a meager penance, then licentiousness became common and virtue existed only in

name. The Middle Age was dark and degraded because the Bible had been taken from the people, conscience had been deprived of a counselor, and sin had ceased to be considered sinful. The Reformation was a return to spiritual living, which brought a changed attitude of men toward evil. The people journeyed again toward Sinai and Calvary. Conscience found a Liberator, truth a Defender, and justice a judgment seat. Sin was revealed, and the sinful sought a Savior.

There is no apology to offer for those who disclaim any desire to know what sin is, and who claim that they are anxious only to get rid of it. We agree that the important question is as to remedy, and we hold that Christianity alone is remedial. But to explain is not to defend or to make void. Research into its nature and location is essential to the proper application of the remedy. The efficiency of the pulpit is here determined. The minister's power in convicting and converting men is largely dependent on his portrayal of sin. As Moody said, "We need to bear

down hard on sin." Wesley, Whitefield, and Spurgeon were great emancipators because they were great preachers of the terrible bondage of evil.

The declining sense of sin has brought peril to evangelism. Our altars are not crowded with publicans and sinners crying out for mercy. Culture of intellect is taking the place of contrition of heart. The Church has gained strength financially and intellectually, but it too often lacks the apostolic authority, which is able to say unto men, "Arise." These conditions are due to the materialistic as well as the ultra-idealistic tendencies of the age. Modern thought has influenced our former conception of the origin and nature of sin. Christian Science and Theosophy, which are merely remnants of Pagan Philosophy, have sought to deny everything that looks like sin. They are not only false in their logic, but deceptive in origin and principle, and utterly unworthy the serious consideration of Christian scholarship. Pantheism would have us believe that all is good because all is God. False

optimism, often blind to the individual element in security and perpetuity, exclaims:

> "God is in His heaven,
> All 's right with the world."

We seem to have lost that consciousness of sin and guilt that voices itself in such words as—

> "O, what form of prayer
> Can serve my turn? Forgive me my foul murder!
> That can not be; since I am still possessed
> Of those effects for which I did the murder."

In the above words we have prayer for mercy checked by an inner sense of horrid guilt. No "gilded hand" is able to shove by justice or excuse the awful deed.

Sin is no superficial thing that can be set aside with a sneer. It is the deep and deadly poison of eternal death. The present situation may be dark, but a better day is dawning in the Christian world. The "gay skepticism" of France and the destructive criticism of Germany are facing the sane forces of a healthy reaction. In the light of the Sun of Righteousness we are to behold the blackness of sin. Dress-parade volunteers are be-

ing made to realize that the crimson tint of self-sacrifice is the true badge of discipleship.

In this study we hope to present the most important theories and by a careful review of the evidences reach some tenable position. We shall aim to present sin in its true nature. When reference is made to natural evil and the ethics and philosophy of non-Christian religions, it will be merely as an aid to our better understanding of moral evil. Our final authority will not be conscience, but revelation and conscience. An important place will be given to the consideration of the origin of sin and its mode of transmission, but our chief contention will be in presenting the *fact of sin* as an existent reality.

The introductory remarks which have been made preparatory to the presentation of this treatise would be incomplete without the acknowledgment of my indebtedness to Dr. Olin A. Curtis, who was for three years my honored professor of Systematic Theology, to Prof. F. F. Ellinwood, of New York University, for two years of study in Comparative Religion, and to Principal A. M.

Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, Oxford, England, whose lectures and personal suggestions I have been privileged to receive. Under their instructions my interest in theology has received a new impetus and my preaching has gained a new power. It was from their teaching and lectures that I first realized the important place that the fact of sin must have in relation to all Christian doctrine.

The succeeding chapters are not intended to present a dogmatic philosophy of moral evil, but to be a plain and practical presentation of an important subject which we consider to be vitally related to the every-day life and experience of the layman as well as the theologian. We have no theory to defend and no special system of doctrine with which we are anxious to harmonize our discussion. The Bible, which we consider the only real source of what we are pleased to term the Christian doctrine of sin, will always be taken as the final standard of judgment in matters of construction and criticism. The message of the following chapters is sent forth with the prayer that it may prove as

helpful to the reader as it has been to the writer in furnishing a solution of the problem of sin which may prove satisfactory to the intellect when supplemented by the completing faith of the heart *and* intellect.

II

THE FACT IN POETRY

"And ah for a man to arise in me,
That the man I am may cease to be."
—Tennyson.

"Two souls are ever striving in my breast,
Each from the other longing to be free."
—Goethe.

"Law can discover sin, but not remove
Save by those shadowy expiations weak."
—Milton.

"Daily with souls that cringe and plot,
We Sinais climb and know it not."
—Lowell.

POETRY

Poets are not theologians. They claim no special dogma and they trust no treasured traditions. It may be said that, though they have a small creed, they often possess a large Christ. They may ignore botany, but they love flowers. They may be indifferent to astronomy, but they are ardent admirers of "the firmament which showeth His handiwork."

Poets live on vision, and where there is no vision poetry perishes. Faith, hope, and love constitute the vital life of poetry no less than of religion. These, when linked to a sincere consecration of truth and virtue, yield rich results in the interpretation of the deeper problems of life. Dr. Dawson claims that "the power of spiritual apprehension is one of the surest signs whereby we know a great poet. It is the function of the great poet to be a seer and interpreter. He sees

farther, deeper, and higher than ordinary men, and interprets for the common man what he dimly feels but does not fully apprehend. It is quite true that the message of the poet and the result of his spiritual insight may not shape with our preconceived notions and theories; but where the spiritual insight is sure and real the true poet never fails to quicken insight in his reader." This statement of an eminent literary critic ought to encourage our search for aid among the leading poets of all ages.

The attitude of mind and heart which characterized those who journeyed to Emmaus was quite in accord with that of our modern Christian poets. Coleridge was a mystic, Byron a pessimist, while Browning was an optimist. They were all artists, but not all were philosophers. Like prophets, our poets were born, not made. God sends many of his best messages to be translated for us by poetic genius.

In our study of sin we may glean many inspired thoughts from the writings of the leading poets. Beginning with Homer, we

have a crude and often unconscious theology. He was very pessimistic in his idea of man, which he once stated thus: "There is nothing more wretched than man." This could not but interfere with his notion of evil. His conception of the Deity was a sort of "combination of all natural tendencies and forces, both good and evil." Sin was little more than the following out of evil impulses inherent in nature. Divinity became the responsible creator and man the irresponsible creature. Sin found its source in the gods themselves, and the individual could not consistently be called a sinner. Evil was merely the stumbling of an individual born blind, who could not be accounted either a saint or a sinner, since he was unmoral or irresponsible for his action. Zeus was a mysterious merging of God and Satan. Guilt was unknown and repentance became impossible. The best interpretation we can place upon his teaching would be to make evil a sort of combined failure on the part of the gods and men. But, however inconsistent it may appear, he still held that "sin deserved death

and punishment was a debt due to the gods." The other great poets of Greece—Sophocles, Euripides, and Æschylus—had a remarkable insight into the existence of guilt as a result of sin—the moral necessity of punishing guilt; but their ideas were vitiated by a gross fatalism.

Dante and Milton both made sin the central fact of their literary inspiration and imagination. Without a vivid conception of sin Dante could never have written "The Inferno," nor could Milton have produced a "Paradise Lost." Though our Italian genius chose to use the most weird and ghastly phrases, still we can not fail to be impressed by his portrayal of the final results of sin. The underlying principles of his great drama are largely correct. That the wages of sin are all that we can crowd into that strongest of all words "death," we must readily admit, but that it is possible for us to classify sins into sharply defined groups and to mete out varied degrees of punishment to different individuals, is wholly speculative. That certain kinds of sins have

their seat more particularly in the emotions or the æsthetic nature, and others may be more clearly traced to the volitional powers, is easily recognized, but to limit sin to any one of these divisions of the senses is impossible. Sin has to do with the whole of personality. We find Dante is in harmony with New Testament teaching in the emphasis he places upon sin as a self-perversion of the will and a criminal betrayal of the trust of human sovereignty. He is very emphatic in his thought of responsibility and guilt. To him sin was not "misfortune, disease, or natural necessity, but rebellion, crime, and self-destruction." The punishment of the sinful was just as essential to his theodicy as the reward of the righteous.

Dante was the "morning star of the Renaissance, and to him was entrusted the vision—that the new culture without the old faith would be the mind's Inferno." Ruskin spoke of him as "the great prophetic exponent of the heart of the Middle Ages." Reason and revelation were his two unfailing

guides. He may be taken as the fulfillment of Tennyson's ideal of a poet:

> "He saw through life and death, through
> good and ill,
> He saw through his own soul.
> The marvel of the everlasting will,
> An open scroll before him lay."

We find in the Divine Comedy the most thorough and careful analysis of all the varied forms of sin that has ever been written. The Purgatorio comprises nine circles, and each one is characterized by some one dominant sin. That these gradations of penalty are not in accord with Scripture need not concern us here, since we are only seeking to interpret the vision as an aid to the study of evil. The real theme as expressed in his own words is, "Man, as rendered liable by ill-desert in the exercise of his free will to punishing justice." He teaches that there is one dominant sin which destroys us, and it may be taken as the basis for classification. While the sinner may for a time determine the degree of his indulgence, he does not possess the power to limit his action to one form of evil.

The first six circles are given up to those who have in a passive sense yielded themselves to carnal sins. Their offense has been directed against themselves rather than others, and is made to include neglect of the sacraments, lust, gluttony, avarice, discontent, and heresy. The last would more properly be placed by itself as belonging to the intellect. The other three are violence, fraudulent violence, and treachery; a careful distinction being made between sin committed through sudden impulse or passion and that which is the result of deliberate action. Those of the latter sort, owing to their greater guilt, are consigned to the lowest circle of hell.

Over the gates through which they pass into the Inferno are inscribed the following words:

> "Reared by power Divine,
> Supremest wisdom, and Eternal Love,
> All hope abandon ye who enter here."

The Inferno is the eternal abiding place of the lost. The "grievous suffering and lamentation" is attributed to "the hopeless-

ness of death, their blind existence, and their unmemorable former life, which makes them envy every other lot." In the first circle we behold "the bright school of the loftiest poets." These of sin are blameless, but belong to the unbaptized family of great poets and philosophers, and they are destined to go on "desiring without hope." Hell is to them not so much a place of suffering as of loss and endless deprivation. The second circle is the abode of the first of actual sinners and the beginning of torment. They are "scourged in the blackness of the hurricane."

> "The stormy blast of hell
> With restless fury drives the spirits on,
> Whirled round and dash'd amain with sore annoy."

These in whom lust has swayed their reason "blaspheme against the good Power in heaven." The next in order we find the gluttonous. They are tortured by being forced to lie in the mire under the ceaseless storm of hail, snow, and discolored water. For the sin

> "Of gluttony, damned vice, beneath this rain,
> E'en as thou seest, I with fatigue am worn."

The same class of souls in Purgatory suffer pangs of hunger in sight of trees laden with fruit. The avaricious, or those who distorted in mind made no use of their money, are punished in a manner indicative of their earthy existence. They who on earth had burdened others to satisfy their selfish greed are now in endless strife and violence made to roll backward and forward heavy weights by the main force of their breasts. The strife is suggestive of their commercial occupation, while the enslaving service is the price of their earthly ease and luxury. As a further mark of his disapproval of this sin, he has effaced all traces of recognition.

The souls of those whom anger overcame are plunged in a filthy pool of bubbling water where in their maddening rage they strangle and tear one another in pieces. "A dolorous strain they gurgle in their throats, but all utterance is denied." The heretics are consigned to the city of Dis, where they are to suffer—

> "Eternal fire,
> That inward burns, shows them with ruddy flame illumed."

The eighth circle is known as the "Evil Budget." As though having exhausted the divisions, he causes this one to include ten pits, into which he dashes as many varieties of fraudulent sinners. In one of the most dismal gulfs he locates the soul of Pope Nicholas. Again he recognizes another, and exclaims:

> 'O, Constantine! of what a world of evil
> Was that dowry the mother, which first converted
> The pastor of the Church into a rich man!"

The last circle is described as a lake of ice where criminal traitors are made to suffer all the bitter pangs of cold. In the lowest pit of hell he finds the treacherous friar Alberigo and Judas Iscariot.

The Inferno was the poet's attempt to present such a vivid conception of sin as to awaken sleepy consciences and impel men to repentance. The portrayal is highly imaginative and realistic. This feature of his style, however, was due not only to the personal pressure of the burden he was bearing, but also to the conviction that the times demanded radical methods. He was the divine

messenger to the spiritual darkness and moral deadness of the age. It was a fourteenth century message, and therefore not amenable to present-day comparison and criticism.

Sin means separation from God in Dante's comedy, in divine revelation, and in human experience. We may also approve the central theme, which asserts that so long as sin exists hell must be its inevitable destiny. The degrees of personal demerit attendant upon different sinful deeds, quite logically led Dante to conclude that the sufferings of the impenitent would likewise vary. The standard of judgment used was not always in accord with the Christian conception of sin. Sin is too often measured by the harm done to individuals, rather than its criminality in the sight of a Holy God. There is a failure in not giving "motive" as rightful a place in the characterization of sin as he gives to passion and impulse. Vice, which is largely a physical evil, should be considered less culpable than blasphemy, which is a sin against the Holy Spirit.

The deepest content in the Christian doctrine of sin is not in its destructive sway over men and nations, but is found in the attitude of the individual toward divine law. We find ourselves in constant danger of over-emphasizing the human results of sin and undervaluing the divine element in the composition of guilt. The chief value of our study will be found in the fact that, to gain any adequate conception of sin, we must see it not only in the present, but in its future aspects. To accomplish this, Dante uses three methods of revealing the true nature of sin: first, "by bringing in the repulsive demons that preside over the circles; in the second place, it is shown in the environment which the sinner endures, and, thirdly, by the inner condition and torment of the sinner himself."

Milton was weak in his delineation of Satan, while Dante has given the best presentation of the sinfulness of sin to be found in all literature.

Milton said, "Myself am hell," but Dante taught that the sinner made his own hell out of his environment. Sin made even the air

"black with its own folly, and hot with its own passion." The sin of earth is linked to the suffering of hell, so that the "tears and blood of earth flow through the Inferno, forming the four rivers in which the evil-doers are punished." Sin carries with it its own penalty and the individual is self-condemned.

The Inferno and Purgatorio are alike in the existence of suffering and toil, but they are unlike in that the one is rebellious and hopeless, while the other is full of resignation and hope. The one is for penalty, the other for purification. The one represents the fixedness of evil, while the other offers the change and regeneration of redemption. In one sight is denied, while in the other there is the promised beatific vision. In one there is constant rebellion, while the other is characterized by cheerful obedience. In one the gravity of evil drags men down, while in the other the gravity of goodness lifts them up. Sin is symbolized by darkness and chains, while redemption is illustrated by light and liberty. To know sin and abide in

it, is hell; but to know God and dwell in Him, is heaven.

Dean Stanley declared that the "Purgatorio" "was the most religious book he had ever read." It is a place of hope, of penitence, and of purification. We may describe it as neither heaven nor hell; but the preparatory school of the penitent seeker after God and heaven. The imperfect are being made perfect through suffering. This is done under divine direction and in hope of attaining the heavenly home. Dante's Purgatory is the Protestant's earthly probation. The work he portrays as taking place after death, we assert, on New Testament authority, must be done before death. What he accomplishes by works, we teach is wrought by faith.

Dante's Purgatorio is an ecclesiastical expediency. The penitent die lacking purification, and the intermediate state involves a time element supposedly in aid of divinity. The New Testament is very explicit in teaching that the only essential delay in forgiveness and purification is that which is due to

the withheld consent of the human will. The existence of Purgatory is of purely human origin and in direct contradiction of Scripture. The vision of the poet is nevertheless interesting and instructive in its analysis of the seven mortal sins which mark the seven ledges of this mountain. This classification is very similar to that which we find in the Inferno. While in the former sin is presented as an active force, in the latter we have it portrayed as a remaining taint which calls for cleansing. Sin in the Inferno was a demon, while here it is merely a disease requiring treatment.

We may confidently expect that a writer with the intellectual scope and insight of a Shakespeare would not go far wrong in respect to a great problem like that of evil. He was not a theologian. He made no special attempt to harmonize the existence of sin and the infinite love of God. He merely accepted conditions and presented the facts as they were. Philip Schaff declared that "Shakespeare was a secular poet and professed no religion at all; that he was hid behind his

characters." The creations, however, are none the less his own and can not but reveal the man behind them.

We know that he always speaks of religion with marked respect. He makes Virtue lovely and Vice hideous. He punishes crime and evil of all sorts and makes his tragedies of great moral power. The reader is always rewarded with a wealth of divine wisdom from the richness of his Scriptural quotations. The unrest and skepticism of the sixteenth century seems not to have shaken his faith in God and Providence. We can have little doubt but that he often bowed before Him whose

> "Blessed feet were nailed
> For our advantage on the bitter Cross."

He believed in the might of Right and the weakness of wrong. Purity to him was but another name for power. The justice of one's claim was a pledge of victory. In King Henry VI we hear him say:

> "What stronger breastplate than a heart untainted!
> Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just,
> And he but naked though locked up in steel,
> Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."

A conscience void of offense toward God and men was to him a man's most sacred possession.

"O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!"

And again we hear him exclaim with all the agony of one in torment:

"My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
And every tongue brings in a several tale,
And every tale condemns me as a villain."

Thus Shakespeare anticipated the modern teaching regarding an "Automatic Judgment Seat."

In his reference to the fact that conscience makes cowards of us all, he must have intended it to refer especially to the guilty man fleeing from justice, since conscience is even more capable of making heroes of men when supported by a Christian conviction of duty. He taught very clearly that the removal of guilt for sin required more than human power. The state of the heart in some cases even made repentance impossible. Hear him speak through the king, in Hamlet,—

"What then? What rests?
Try what repentance can: What can it not?
Yet what can it, when one can not repent?
O wretched state; O bosom black as death!
O limed soul, that struggles to be free,
Art more engaged."

He must have believed in the necessity and efficacy of a divine atonement and that sin was something more than an error of the intellect, a disease of the body or a remnant of animalism. It was not a superficial taint that was capable of being washed away by any outward application.

"Though some of you with Pilate, wash your hands,
Showing an outward pity, yet you Pilates
Have here delivered me to my sour cross,
And water can not wash away your sin."

That sin is certain to be revealed was another of the tenets of our poet's faith.

"Time will unfold what plaited cunning hides,
Who covers faults at last with shame derides."

And again he asks the question—

"How is it with me when every noise appalls me?
Guiltiness will speak though tongues were out of use."

The moment we come in contact with King Lear, Gloster, or Montague we are made to feel keenly that the way of the transgressor is hard. There can be no cheating of infinite justice, however much there may be among men. Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished.

"In the corrupted currents of this world
Offense's gilded hand may shove by justice;
But 't is not so above. There is no shuffling;
There the action lies in his true nature, and we ourselves
Compelled, even to the teeth and forehead of our faults,
To give in evidence."

Divine justice as well as love is supported by Omnipotence. There is no chance for failure with the Absolute. The law of sin is death. Sin can neither be excused nor covered up.

"Foul deeds will rise,
Though all the earth o'erwhelm them, to men's eyes."

In King Lear we are assured that—

"The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to plague us."

Shakespeare held very strongly to human freedom and responsibility for sin. He was, however, equally confident that through the medium of divine Providence

"There 's a divinity that shapes our ends
Rough-hew them how we will."

Even the villain in King Lear scoffs at the suggestion of men being "fools by compulsion, or drunkards, liars, and adulterers by

the enforced obedience of some external power.'' There can be no justification in any apology which seeks to excuse us from guilt of sin and falsely accuse God of its authorship. Browning's Guido would annul his criminal career by a theory of divine necessity, but the bard of Avon has no such character. Man is not left to struggle alone with worldly temptation, nor to follow the guidance of a partially obscured vision. Divinity is ever present to supplement our imperfections. Behind our ''knowing in part'' is His omniscience and underneath our weakness are the arms of His omnipotence.

With the exception of the Inspired Writings, there is no more vivid and heart-searching portrayal of the remorse of guilt than that of Richard III, who during that awful night of agony cried:

" O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!
The lights burn blue. It is now dead midnight.
Cold, fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
What do I fear? Myself? There 's none else by.
Richard loves Richard; That is, I am I.
Is there a murderer here? No! Yes, I am:
Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason why:
Lest I revenge. What, myself upon myself?

Alack, I love myself. Wherefore ? for any good
That I myself have done unto myself,
For hateful deeds committed by myself!
I am a villain : yet, I lie, I am not.
Fool, of thyself speak well ; Fool, do not flatter!
My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
And every tongue brings in a several tale,
And every tale condemns me for a villain.
Perjury, perjury in the highest degree,
Murder, stern murder in the direst degree,
All several sins, all used in each degree,
Throng to the bar, crying all, Guilty! Guilty!
I shall despair. There is no creature loves me,
And if I die no soul shall pity me.
Nay, wherefore should they, since that I myself
Find in myself no pity to myself?"

How prophetic of pain those "cold, fearful drops that stand on his trembling flesh!" What keen remorse that causes conscience to rise as with "a thousand several tongues" of condemnation! How hard to be forced to hate one's self and confess the villain's guilt! How real the automatic Judgment seat that caused the unpardoned Past to stand before the bar of conscience while each several sin cries, Guilty, Guilty! What utter loneliness when neither in the world without nor from the soul within can peace be found! The entire picture is suggestive of that spiritual Laocoon of the great apostle, when he ex-

claimed: "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

Milton has been called the poet of the sublime, but he was also the bard of theology. The great Epics which are inseparably connected with his name are almost wholly Scriptural and have as their central theme the fact of sin. We find the key to Paradise Lost in the first few lines of that immortal poem:

> "Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world and all its woe,
> With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
> Restore us and regain the blissful seat."

The authority of our Miltonic message ought to be of high rank, if we value properly the purity of his character, the loftiness of his purpose, and the wisdom of his genius. All his verses were born of noble prayer and under the guidance of the Spirit, that he might assert the truths of "Eternal Providence and justify the ways of God to men." Such was the aim of the greatest of England's poets. He was the poetic prophet of

Paradise who so loved God and man that his highest desire was to make it possible for them to live in mutual harmony.

Paradise was to him an ideally happy place, and they who lived therein were a heaven-favored folk. Satan, who is the hero of the Epic, is made the primal cause of man's Fall. He was the "infernal serpent whose guile deceived the mother of mankind." In these few words we have his theory of the origin of sin, but the explanation has in it more fiction than fact. Satan is always described as acting contrary to God's high will, and "evil is his sole delight." Since Divine Providence seeks to "bring forth good out of our evil, Satan labors to pervert that end, and out of good to still find some means of evil."

This is true to the experience of daily life and personal consciousness. The arch-enemy of the good is finally defeated and "chained on the burning lake," yet rebellious and resolute in his determination to overcome the dire calamity. Milton agrees with much of divine teaching concerning Satan in linking past

defeat with present limitation. The expression, "better to reign in hell than serve in heaven," is the language of the outcast rebel.

As to human freedom and responsibility, he says:

> "I made man just and right,
> Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall.
> Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell."

This is in strict accord with what Leibnitz would designate as "the best of all possible worlds." The moral sphere could not be founded on necessity. It is possible to imagine a world without human freedom, but impossible to have had man in it as a responsible moral being. The poet is careful to justify God and present man as responsible for his own ruin.

The second element which concerns the accountability of the individual is also explained in the following words:

> "They themselves decreed
> Their own revolt, not I. If I foreknew,
> Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault."

The parent may foreknow the action of the child, and yet the fact of knowledge in no

way interferes with the freedom of choice. Foreknowledge may be said to transcend freedom, but does not determine action.

> "Men trespass, authors to themselves in all,
> Both what they judge and what they choose; for so
> I formed them free, and free they must remain,
> Till they enthrall themselves."

The question of guilt is also closely related to that of freedom and individual self-consciousness. Those who feel their guilt must acknowledge that—

> "They themselves ordained their fall.
> The first sort by their own suggestion fell,
> Self-tempted, self-depraved; Man falls, deceived
> By th' other first: Man therefore shall find grace;
> The other none. In mercy and justice both."

The Father presents man's need and sin in all its destructive power, to which the Son replies: "Shall man be finally lost and the Adversary thus obtain his end and frustrate Thine? Shall he fulfill his malice and Thy goodness bring to naught?" In other words, the Only-begotten of the Father raised the question which has troubled many fearful souls all down the centuries: "Shall Good fail and Evil triumph?" Though we have too

often failed in our faith, still Omnipotence has always answered in the affirmative. He who is rich in resources of helpfulness declared:

> "I will renew
> Man's lapsed powers though forfeit and enthralled
> By sin, to foul exorbitant desires:
> Upheld by me, yet once more he shall stand
> On even ground against his mortal foe.
> And I will place within him as a guide
> My umpire Conscience."

The author now comes to the law of sin and the union of justice and love. Personal sin is an act of "rebellion against the high supremacy of heaven which affects even the Godhead." The transgressor loses all, and he with his whole posterity must die.

> "Die he or Justice must; unless for him
> Some other, able and as willing pay
> The rigid satisfaction, death for death."

God will have His ear attentive and His eye watchful in mercy and long-suffering, always striving to soften stony hearts, and yet the wage of sin must be death. That justice is inherent in the essential character of Deity is a fact that the great majority of critics fail to grasp. The Atonement can

never be considered as an unnecessary sacrifice to those who have any clear conception of God as a being of absolute perfection and holiness or of sin as a violation of divine law. This was clear to the mind of Milton when he declared that either the sinner or Justice must die, so long as no sufficient satisfaction be offered.

The Son, in answer to God's plea for man, exclaimed:

> "Behold Me, then: Me for him, life for life
> I offer; on Me let Thine anger fall;
> Account Me man: I for his sake will leave
> Thy bosom and this glory next to Thee
> Freely put off, and for him lastly die
> Well pleased; on Me let Death wreak all his rage.
> So Heavenly love shall outdo Hellish hate."

Christ in His incarnation became the new head of the race in Adam's stead, and,

> "As in one all perish so in Thee,
> As from a second root, shall be restored
> As many as are restored; without Thee none.
> Adam's sin makes guilty all his sons; Thy merit,
> Imputed, shall absolve them who renounce
> Their own both righteous and unrighteous deeds,
> And live in Thee transplanted, and from Thee
> Receive new life."

Paradise Regained, which is the completing complement of Paradise Lost, was com-

posed by Milton through the suggestion of his Quaker friend, Thomas Ellwood. As he had sung his inspired dirge of sin's sad entrance into the world, so now he sings the joyful chorus of Redemption. Again we find the statement of his theme in the opening words:

> "I who erewhile the happy Garden sung
> By one man's disobedience lost, now sing
> Recovered Paradise to all mankind,
> By one man's firm obedience fully tried.
> Through all temptation and the Tempter foiled
> In all his wiles, defeated and repulsed,
> And Eden raised in the waste wilderness."

His treatment of the Atonement is weakened by his effort to place the temptation and obedience of Christ in contrast with the temptation and disobedience of Adam. Eden is made the scene of Paradise Lost, and the Wilderness the place where Paradise was regained. There is a certain beauty in all this which is permissible to poetry, but it is not good theology.

The fact is that Paradise Regained can not be limited to the temptation of Jesus, but must be made to extend from the Advent at

Bethlehem to the morning of the Resurrection. The arena of temptation is not the chief concern of either divinity or humanity. There would have been better ground for having chosen either Calvary's cross or the empty tomb in Joseph's garden. We all pass through the narrow gate of testing, but our definite work of life comes later. To withstand evil is negative, but to serve the good is positive. The prevalence of evil is not indicative of its importance.

Paradise Lost assures us that Paradise Regained is to follow, but the analysis of the redemptive work is left for his later Epic. The sacrifice had been offered and accepted in heaven, and yet there must be the mysterious touch and union of the divine and the human, if sin was to find an effective remedy. The Incarnation was to be the seal of Satan's defeat and the certain revelation that God was able

> "To produce a man
> Of female seed, far abler to resist
> All his solicitations and at length
> All his vast force and drive him back to Hell—
> Winning by conquests, what the first man lost
> By fallacy surprised."

Evil continues to be the abnormal enemy that gained admission by deception and deceit. "Sin and Death, the two grand foes of man," are both to be conquered by "this perfect Man by merit called God's Son, and He to earn salvation for the sons of men."

The poetic portrayal of the triumph of Jesus in every phase of the temptation in the Wilderness is a beautiful realization of the genius of our inspired messenger. The obedient Son endued with power divine prevails against "the attempter of the Father's throne, and he with all his host are cast down." A fairer Paradise is founded now for Adam and his chosen sons. In the closing lines of the poem the writer breaks forth in strains of exultant joy:

"Hail, Son of the Most High, heir of both Worlds,
Queller of Satan! On Thy glorious work
Now enter, and begin to save mankind."

The existence of evil was to Tennyson a mental mystery. The solution was supplemented by his never-failing faith, which may be found in the following lines:

"Strong Son of God, immortal love,
Whom we that have not seen Thy face,
By faith and faith alone embrace,
Believing where we can not prove."

He was conscious of the power of purity in individual lives when he wrote:

> 'My strength is as the strength of ten
> Because my heart is pure."

His conception of human depravity is found in his apt reply to a friend:

> "If there be a devil in man
> There is an angel too."

We also find he was very clear in his expression of guilt as one of the results of sin:

> "His gain is loss: for he that wrongs his friend
> Wrongs himself more, and ever bears about
> A silent court of justice in his heart,
> Himself the judge and jury, and himself
> The prisoner at the bar, ever condemned."

He despised evil, and yet he was desirous, though he knew not:

> "That somehow good
> Will be the final goal of ill."

and

> "That nothing walks with aimless feet
> That not one life shall be destroyed,
> Or cast as rubbish to the void
> When God hath made the pile complete."

This larger hope, as he expressed it, was not a settled conviction, but the ecstatic voice of "children crying in the night."

Sin has made society abnormal, and the individual had become weakened and depraved, so that the poet was merely giving expression to humanity's deepest longing when he cried out of his conscious need:

> "O for a man to arise in me
> That the man I am may cease to be."

It would be difficult to find in all literature a more perfect prayer for the work of divine regeneration than that of the preceding lines. The ethical theory of Tennyson has thus been formulated: "The soul must rule the senses, and not the senses rule the soul, while the soul itself must be ruled not by self, but by the higher love that finds its deepest life in sacrifice."

His "vision of sin" presents the desecration of life and the sad death of the soul. The sin is largely sensual, and the subject,

> "A youth who came riding toward a palace-gate
> And rode a horse with wings."

This is suggestive of the "high spiritual possibility" of life. We have been granted wings to aid us in rising from the low level

of selfishness to the heights of self-sacrificing service. The "heavy rider that held him down" may be represented as the sensual self. First there comes "a child of sin," who leads him into an environment of evil. The very air seems charged with the bacilli of vice. The music is so voluptuous that those who hear it sigh and grow pale. Now it rises and "storms in orbs of song" until all are in a giddy whirl of sound. The crowd suddenly start from their places as though moved by violence. They catch each other in wild grimaces, and, "dashing together, are killed as with some luxurious agony."

The scene is altered. Beyond the darkness and the cataract God appears as "a rose of awful dawn." This is the divine call to the heights, but it passes unheeded. The neglected light disappears, and in its place comes a formless, hueless vapor. In place of the youth we have the old man, lean as death. Sin robs the cheek of its flush of health and leaves only the taint of visible vice. The palace is exchanged for the ruined inn. The pure companions of the home are thrust

aside for those of passion and lust. The depraved speech is evidenced in all his conversation. Though he remembers the time when he thought his youth half divine, still he displays a rude indifference to things once sacred. Sensuality has made him a cynic and an atheist. The individual who once had wings to rise toward heaven, now describes himself as a fish that loves the mud.

Fame, friendship, and virtue are all alike "mixed with the cunning sparks of hell." We are men of ruined blood,

> "Ruined trunks on wither'd forks,
> Empty scarecrows, I and you."

The revelry and blasphemy continue until the voice grows faint and there comes a further change. The "longer night" is near, and death is soon to claim its own. The "mystic mountain range" again appears, and then a voice is heard:

> "Behold! it was a crime
> Of sense avenged by sense that wore with time."

These were the words of the demon that sought to excuse his guilt. He would limit

sin to the lower life, and thereby justify the sinner. Presently we hear a second voice, and Error is exposed by Truth, as expressed in the following lines:

> "The crime of sense became
> The crime of malice, and is equal blame."

The moral life is a unity, and the individual always acts through his total personality. The sad death of the impenitent ends with a cry to the summit:

> "Is there any hope?
> To which an answer pealed from the highlands,
> But in a tongue no man could understand;
> And on the glimmering limit far withdrawn
> God made Himself an awful rose of dawn."

The fact is herein certified that from the dawn of life to the declining hours of old age God never fails to break the vision of sin with that higher vision of redemption. In the life of Lancelot we find that sin mars even the features of the face:

> "The great and guilty love he bore the Queen,
> In battle with the love he bare his lord,
> Had marred his face and mark'd it ere his time."

The sin of Guinevere wrecks a nation as well as an individual. The very perfection of

King Arthur becomes an offense to her whose life had been touched with the taint of sin.

> "He is all fault who has no fault at all,
> For who loves me must have a touch of earth."

After long years of fatal delay she gives expression to the prayer of penitence:

> "Help me, Heaven, for surely I repent,
> For what is true repentance but in thought
> Not even in inmost thought to think again
> The sins that made the past so pleasant to us."

The sense of sin still haunts her even after the injured one has pledged his forgiveness and bid her do for her own soul the rest. This she failed to do, and remorse of conscience suggests suicide, but

> "What help in that? I can not kill my sin,
> If soul be soul; nor can I kill my shame."

Waiting and wisdom suggest a better way.

> "And left me hope
> That in mine own heart I can live down sin."

The regeneration is complete and she beholds him whom she had wronged as "the highest and most human."

In Geriant and Enid we behold sin eating like a canker at the heart of him who was

wedded to the lovely daughter of Yniol. Personal impurity made him suspicious of purity. The sin of self-indulgence had become the mother of a score or more of dreadful crimes.

> "O purblind race of miserable men,
> How many among us this very hour
> Do forge a life-long trouble for ourselves
> By taking true for false, or false for true."

Enid was the innocent victim of an evil jealousy, but she suffered nobly, with a love that never failed. The sin of lust was at last conquered by the self-sacrifice of Love,

> "Nor did he doubt her more
> But rested in her fealty, till he crown'd
> A happy life with a fair death."

The poem of Gareth and Lynette is a sort of ethical allegory wherein the soul of man is assailed at each period of its earthly life by enemies personified in Morning, Noon, Evening, and Night. These represent the characteristic sins which arrest the spiritual ascendency of the individual. Youth faces the subtle and deceptive sins which make their assault under the guise of pleasure and delight.

Sir Noonday-Sun follows with a second attack, which is aimed at manhood's most vulnerable point. The glitter of gold and the ambition for worldly success are here used as the basis of the appeal. The spiritual is dimmed by the material, and only after a courageous contest is the victory won. The power of habitual sin is illustrated in the struggle of Gareth endeavoring to free himself from the enslaving power of Sir Evening Star. The continuance of sin hardens the heart, deadens the conscience, and weakens the will. The danger of defeat always lurks in the delay of our complete emancipation.

> "He seemed as one
> That all in later, sadder age begins
> To war against ill uses of a life,
> But these from all his life arise, and cry,
> 'Thou hast made us lords and can'st not put us down.'"

The poet seems to follow the teaching of Paul not only in his portrayal of the war which the flesh wages against the Spirit, but also in naming Night, or Death, as the last enemy we are called upon to conquer. This final battle is one of great reward, for,

"Out from this
Issued the bright face of a blooming boy
Fresh as a flower newborn."

Triumphant Death is the beginning of eternal youth. Sin is vanquished and Good becomes victorious.

So large mirth lived and Gareth won the quest."

Lynette lived her life under the dominion of the senses and blind to her higher spiritual vision. Only during the closing days did she come to know the secret of Gareth's triumph:

"Then she clapt her hands,
Full merry am I to find my goodly knave
Is knight and noble."

"The Holy Grail" is a sort of poetic Pilgrim's Progress. The quest is for the recovery of the vision of purity, which had been lost through the entrance of sin. To those who live in sin the Good is always lost. The recovery is brought about not by pilgrimages, but by the purification of the heart. Purity is always an essential to seeing good and God. The senses are in constant opposition to the

soul. Each pilgrim has to encounter various forms of evil as he travels toward the highways of holiness. The pearl of great price is secured only at the cost of selling all. The Highest must have pre-eminence.

The good must give place to the best. Even the love of home and the prattle of little children—"those truants from heaven"—must not delay the search. The prize of wealth and the praise of fame, together with the attractiveness of human ambition—must all take subordinate positions to the one divine imperative—the possession of purity. Each knight experienced his own peculiar temptations and trials and was compelled to wage a continuous warfare for supremacy. Sir Galahad had gained the secret of success, when he learned that,

> "His strength was as the strength of ten
> Because his heart was pure."

The denial of self was the last victory in the conquest of the spiritual. He is now equipped for the call of service,

> "And in the strength of this he rode
> Shattering all evil customs everywhere."

The victory over sin within had preceded the conquest of sin without. Lancelot describes the cause of his failure in the following lines:

> "In me lived a sin
> So strange, of such a kind that all of pure
> Noble, and knightly in me twined and clung
> Round that one sin, until the wholesome flower
> And poisonous grew together."

Sin made him weak who *once* was strong. He had thought it little and unseen, forgetting that no sin is small. It may be secret, but it is the open door to other evil.

The poet makes his life proof of the fact that our sins are sure to find us out. In the hour of his unrest and remorse he exclaims:

> "I will embark and I will lose myself,
> And in the great sea wash away my sins."

But in this hour of threatened tragedy Doubt is lost in Faith. He is led to a quiet room where he hears the sweet voice of music. The song speaks of Hope and Victory. He begins the ascent out of the depths of Doubt toward the heights of Faith.

> "Up I climbed a thousand steps
> With pain: as in a dream I seemed to climb
> For ever."

The pain was the price of penitence. The goal was the Mount of Purity. We find here a sample theory of evolution. Men are to

> "Move upward, working out the beast
> And let the ape and tiger die."

This couplet, which is a favorite quotation of many, is merely a poetic symbolizing of moral redemption and can not be taken as proof that Tennyson was a devotee of Darwin. His message in its totality is against any such conclusion.

We have reached the conclusion of our study of the poets, which of necessity has been very brief. In the limited space of one short chapter it is only possible to select a few of the most prominent leaders in this special line of thought, but we desire this beginning to prepare the reader to continue his investigations in what we believe to be one of the richest and most suggestive fields of literature for both the layman and the student.

III

THE FACT IN EVOLUTION

"Sin is not being imperfect at all, but a contravention of what ought to be at a given moment, and what can lay claim to unconditioned worth. If evil is supposed to consist only in development, which God has willed in His character as Creator, then its absolute wrongfulness must come to an end. The non-realization of the idea can not be blameworthy in itself, if the innate law of life itself prescribes progressiveness of development."—"System of Doctrine."

—Dorner.

"Taking the ethical and evolutionary theories, I contend that it is impossible to derive out of them conceptions of sin and guilt adequate to the Christian view. It is evident that, in all such theories, sin is made something necessary —not something that might be or could be, but an absolute necessity. In every one of them, the original condition ot man is supposed to be such that sin could not but resulf from it. This, it seems to me, is practically to empty the idea of sin of its real significance, and to throw the responsibility of it directly back on the Creator."

—Professor James Orr.

EVOLUTION

Evolution in the thought of many is accepted as the panacea for all our ills. This so-called "New Theology" of the "pure and uncompromising monotheists" is also being used to explain the Fact of Sin. The devotees of this latest "fad" are, however, so deficient in that essential attribute known as "homogeneity," that it is very difficult to preserve any unity of discussion. We shall of necessity limit our criticism largely to the theory of Professor Fiske, as presented in his book entitled, "Through Nature to God."

The first chapter deals with what he terms the "legend of the lost Paradise, which has figured in the story of the fall of man." The author treats the Edenic narrative merely as a Persian fable. Paradise is described as an ancient zoological garden. The fall of man was after all not a "fall," but in order to harmonize divine revelation with this new hypothesis, it is considered a "rising." Sin

is made an essential in the upward progress of man. The latest expression of this philosophy has come from R. J. Campbell, of London, who asserts that "sin itself is a quest for God." "The man who got dead drunk last night did so because of the impulse within him to break through the barriers of his limitations, to express himself, and to realize a more abundant life. The drunken debauch was a quest for life, a quest for God." This attempted analysis of sin is no explanation, but a deceptive degradation and denial of a spiritual reality.

The total Christian plan of redemption is against such an interpretation. The Bible records the fact that "man was made by a Divine Creator out of the dust of the ground," but Evolution says he came up out of the brute creation. Paul claims that man's fall was downward, but Professor Fiske declares that it was upward. Divine Revelation asserts that man was made in the image of God, while evolutionists make him the more or less improved image of the anthropoid ape. Again it is said, "We can at least be-

gin to realize that if our eyes had not been opened so that we might know good and evil, we should never have become fashioned in the divine image." But in another book of divine authority we have the statement that primal man was made in that image.

Shall we accept evolution and praise Satan for tempting Adam, and look upon the fall not as a curse but as a blessing? But knowledge of good and evil may be acquired in another, better way. The chief evidence against saying that they did not already have this knowledge in its proper sense, is based on the statement of Satan which we must class with two previous falsehoods. They knew God, and therefore they knew good. The expression, "knowledge of good and evil," as used by the Old Testament writers, referred to the guilt and shame which accompanied voluntary transgression, and *not* to the acquisition of a moral nature. As a proof of this, let us refer to the first verse of the thirty-ninth chapter of Deuteronomy, "Moreover your little ones . . . who to-day have no knowledge between good and evil."

The shame manifest in the action of Adam and Eve was from the guilt of sin, and not necessarily from the opening of their eyes to good and evil. Jesus Christ knew good and evil, yet He was never ashamed, because He never committed sin. What is meant here is the *sinner's idea of good and evil,* not the proper knowledge as possessed by the sinless moral nature. Strack says: "Had man withstood the temptation, he would have known that he had remained loyal to the will of God, that is good, and kept himself aloof from evil. He would thus without partaking of the fruit, by overcoming temptation, have attained the knowledge of good and evil, only in a different, not maleficent manner." Delitzsch and Dillmann agree with this view.

"The Fall was the creation of man's evil nature of selfishness and disobedience, the most tremendous act of independent volition ever put forth by man. It revolutionized his being. It changed the direction of the deepest streams of life. The changed nature must have been transmitted, since there was no other nature to transmit. Evolution became

the evolution of a dwarfed and degraded humanity, or, in other words, development became degradation." This is a strong statement in support of the fact that sin entered the race by the free-will act of the individual, and not by any heredity of "brute nature." We prefer the Biblical view to that of the evolutionist, who says: "Looking back through the glasses of modern science, we behold him (man) at first outwardly a brute, feebly holding his own against many fierce competitors. He has no wants above those of the beast; he lives in holes and dens in the rocks; he is a brute, even more feeble in body than many of the animals with which he struggles for a brute portion." We are apt to conclude that these "modern science" lenses were improperly ground, so that the image was seriously distorted. If man was "outwardly a brute," was he inwardly a man? But if he was inwardly a man, then he was not in any sense a brute. "Man's feeble effort to hold his own" is a poor argument for the "Survival of the Fittest." We see the "hole whence we were dug," but

just how we came to change our mind and evolute into a man, when we had no mind to change, is not specifically stated. Why should hundreds of centuries have elapsed before man began to live as man, or, in other words, to live as "normally in his kingdom as the brutes in theirs?" The key to these mysterious speculations is found alone in the fact of the Fall.

In the second chapter, Professor Fiske claims that "matter is not only considered as what Dr. Martineau would call an objective of God," but it is endowed with a diabolical character of its own. The following chapter accuses those who deny that God is the author of evil, of limiting the Absolute and sacrificing his Omnipotence in order to save the attribute of goodness. He would eliminate the idea of a devil and claim the honor of being the "first discoverer of pure and uncompromising" monotheism.

"Matter is God's self-limitation under the law of cause and effect," says Dr. Strong. Humanity is self-limitation of God under the law of freedom. Incarnation and atonement are the self-limitations of God under the law

of grace. Self-limitation in this sense—when it is for high moral purposes and self-imposed—is *not* a limitation. In fact, the limitations referred to God are unreal and do not interfere with any of His attributes of Deity. We in no sense limit God by saying that He is not the author of evil, and that He created free moral beings with the "possibility" of evil. It is the act of a king, who, although having full power over the lives of his subjects, grants them freedom in order to ennoble manhood. He had the power to imprison them all, but this lower method is set aside and a higher one adopted in its stead.

We shall now consider the statement that the existence of evil is necessary to the existence of good. To affirm that "we can not know anything whatever except by contrast with something else" is to deny the real essence and substance of everything. No health without disease. No pleasure without pain. No pure food without poisonous. Listen to Browning:

"Can we love but on condition that the thing we love must die?
Need there groan a world in anguish just to teach us sympathy!"

Must there be a raging storm outside my house before I can be conscious of the fire in the grate? Has fire no inherent reality? Has the good no positive character? Must we conclude that these things are only mere illusions of the mind, unable to have any real existence in separation from their counterpart? This is the sort of metaphysical speculation which would make good—considered as an objective reality—non-existent.

In speaking of consciousness and of life resulting from continual change, he states that the only way to be conscious of atmospheric pressure is to climb a mountain. A man whose mind is engaged by other things for the time being is unconscious of the ticking of the clock; therefore we must conclude that the clock was not ticking. Subjective thought seems, at times, to determine objective reality. If evil is in any vital sense necessary to good, then the lessening of evil must interfere with our conception of the good.

Man is not a brute; he does not need to associate a club with disobedience in order that he may know obedience. He is endowed

with self-consciousness, and every experience has a reality of its own, aside from contrasts and counterparts. The whole basis of the argument is deceptive. In the final analysis, such a conception of good and evil simply means that, without sin, our conception of good would not be *exactly* as it is. If we had no counterfeit money, our notion of currency would be slightly changed. If the saloon did not exist, our notion of society would be slightly different. We admit that our notion of good is influenced by the existence of evil, but if sin were non-existent we would still be able to know good.

The assertion that "God is the Creator of evil, and from the eternal scheme of things diabolism is forever excluded" may be absolute and uncompromising monism, but it can not be accepted as the Christian notion of a God of infinite love and justice. A God who has on every page of His Revealed Word and in every phase of physical existence pronounced His eternal hatred toward sin, can not with any degree of consistency be accounted its author. Truth is always prefer-

able to the theory of an untruth. The unity of good and evil as to origin means the non-existence of both as such. "The dualism which is implied in all attempts to refer good and evil to different creative sources" may *appear* to be remedied. But the effort to "get rid of the devil and to make all the universe the multiform manifestation of a single, all-pervading Deity" has resulted in incorporating the devil as a new attribute of Deity. Does it add to the perfection of God to make Him the author of the evil as well as the good? The author in his attempt to escape what he interprets as the "Scylla" of his opponents, has himself fallen into a self-constructed "Charybdis."

If, on the other hand, sin be said to have an "indispensable function" in the world, then it is no longer evil, but good. In accord with this, the manifold expressions of wrath and judgment against sin, Christ's deep loathing and shrinking from its bitterness must all be interpreted as contradictory and meaningless. God's entire attitude toward sin, the remorse and guilt which always fol-

low wrong-doing, and the incidental wages as manifest in this life, all stand in direct opposition to the preceding view.

The attempt to locate sin in matter destroys our entire notion of its real nature. If depravity is no more than the "brute matter" which clings to us in our rise from the lower animal existence, then, morally, man is *still* a brute and not a man. Sin is no longer sin, but a natural part of our animal existence.

Evolution proper has but one form, and that may be termed naturalistic. It is a mechanical method by which man is supposed to be evolved from the lower forms of life. Nature is a unity, and the solidarity of the race is extended so as to include all animate life, but the coming from a lower to a higher necessitates a helping hand reached down from above. The "survival of the fittest" can never explain the existing forms of life, nor can it offer rational evidence in support of man's elevation and unique characteristics. Moral life is not animal life elevated, but something essentially different. Moral

obligation can not come from a plane of being which has nothing higher than brute instinct.

In the language of the Christian Evolutionist, and in order to be up-to-date, we must say that the house built by John Smith was not builded, but evolved. The world created by God was likewise an evolution. The five loaves and two small fishes either evoluted into food sufficient for the multitude, or the crowd was deceived. Adam was in reality not created by the Creator, but he was the outgrowth of some previous form of life. "Evolution, both etymologically and rationally, means the passage into explicitness of that which was before implicit." Spencer says: "Then were we an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, but we are hoping to evolve toward a definite coherent heterogeneity." This will doubtless be a delightful state when we reach it, but as to *how* we are to reach it and who is to inform us of our arrival, we are not instructed. The Psalmist says "man was made a little lower than God, and was crowned with honor and glory;" and John, carrying out the same thought as to

man's supremacy, exclaims: "Now are we the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

The author of "Evil and Evolution" states that "the world is fast adapting itself to the physical forces of Nature, and is falling into line with the moral principles of the universe. Maladjustment is being corrected, and evil is vanishing." But whence this adaptation and identification with the higher moral forces and why this maladjustment? Shall we assume that this maladjustment was primal in order that the evolutionist may have a basis for the construction of a theory which is constantly embarrassed by more exceptions than agreements with its law? A solution of the problem that is based on the assumption that "evil is in the world simply because the whole system of things is imperfect," is very superficial and unsatisfactory.

Again we are expected to gain moral profit from the promised hope that "as the system evolves evil will disappear." This is

mere presumption and at variance with the facts of history. The author goes on to explain that "in the great work of creation we can not expect perfection at first. Some little confusion and blundering must be looked for until things have shaken down a little and have had time to get into proper adjustment." The conception of the Divine Creator is that of a blundering workman unable to avoid imperfections. This is charity for Deity which is contradictory to character. If the Father was unable to avoid blundering maladjustments, whence the Power that is to direct "this absolutely perfect universe" of the future? But imperfection is not sin. The unevolved represents none of the elements of moral evil. Sin is centered in another sphere. It is the chosen act of an individual, and not the maladjustment of an organism. The free act of knowledge, and not the unavoidable blunder of ignorance. The existence of sin is equally as prevalent among the supposedly higher classes as among the lower unevolved.

The fact is that the physical phase of the

problem is of least importance in our analysis of moral evil. Sin is almost wholly moral and spiritual in nature. Earthquakes and storms must be classed as physical calamities and have no special bearing upon the fact of sin. The scientist who declares that sin did not originate with man, places himself on record as an opponent of the Christian doctrine of sin.

The argument that "the present adjustment of the system is productive of more good than evil" fails to meet the real issue. It furnishes no justification of either God or man. We can not conceive of an absolutely holy and omnipotent Father creating anything but the best possible world in which there would be *on His part* no imperfection. God creates by divine fiat, while man develops his productions through experience. The existence of evil is attributed to the limitations of the infinite. The very statement is a contradiction. It is excusing personal guilt on the ground of impersonal deficiencies. The inference may be good, but the method is bad. The "awful maladjustments

and imperfections'' are apparently the only thing visible to these empiricists. Good and evil seem to be little more than questions of economic and physical well-being. Suffering is branded as evil and nothing but evil. The very principles of their theory deprive them of the ''upward look'' and make even their reasoning ''of the earth and earthy.'' In another place we are told that ''there can be no reconciliation of science and religion until we can agree on some *reasonable* theory of accounting for the strange fact that a God who is said to love itself—just, true, good, merciful, fatherly—can yet work for immeasurable ages by every phase of cruelty and wrong.'' This sounds like Renan's subjective pessimism, which asserted that ''since Christianity was not true, nothing was worth living for.'' But Christianity is not untrue and our God has not been working through the centuries ''by every phase of cruelty and wrong.'' The price of the proposed reconciliation is one which Christianity will never pay. Naturalistic evolution is not altered in character by

being robed in ecclesiastical millinery and labeled with theistic nomenclature.

Another statement made by this same author is "that in all stages of life a *certain degree* of selfishness would obviously be indispensable to the individual's care of himself." The comment may seem severe, and yet we can not refrain from saying that a scientist with a moral sensibility incapable of making any distinction between that which we term the sin of selfishness and that other divine endowment which furnishes the instinct of self-care, lacks the qualifications essential to dealing with any phase of Christian morals. They further assert that "nothing in the whole universe is created perfect." Life in all its circling spirals is a grand crescendo. The very highest is a development from the very lowest, and this is held to be as true of the archangels as of men. The very logic of such an affirmation would compel the inclusion of God Himself, and then their "boot strap" evolving universe would be complete. Every phase of the supernatural which does not chance to fit into

the ultra-dogmatic creed of these modern philosophers must be sacrificed.

F. R. Tennant, in a course of lectures on the "Origin and Propagation of Sin" before the University of Cambridge, recently said "that there was a Godward side to the problem of sin upon which a man is qualified to speak in proportion as his own life approximates to the pattern of the sinless One." He asked his hearers to descend with him to a distinctly lower level of discussion—a merely intellectual, as distinguished from a spiritual point of view." This is a just and honest apology for his method of treatment, which was wholly from the standpoint of an evolutionist. In the introductory lecture he affirms that "in dealing with the origin of sin in the conception of development, for the present we have to move largely in the sphere of theory and speculation."

The first part of the discussion has to do with his theory as to the development of the moral consciousness. This, he asserts, "is found in the savage largely in germ, and action is either impulsive or determined by

tribal custom; since the tribal self precedes the personal self." He admits that the scientist has no knowledge of primitive man, and since there can be no such thing as prehistoric history they are compelled to fall back on the method which the physicist calls "extrapolation." The conclusions are drawn from learned generalizations that are based on pure hypotheses. Moral consciousness is no longer a divine endowment; it *must* be construed as a human evolution. The "must" here used is in behalf of a theory, and is made to take precedence to the "must" of Christian fact and experience.

But we may be permitted to inquire why the savage of to-day can be considered younger than the citizen of civilization. They have both been afforded ages of opportunity for evolving. The Hottentot is as ancient as the Englishman. If there is this universal immanence which is continually evolving the higher complex out of the lower elementary, how shall we account for the fact that certain races have remained for centuries untouched? Again, we ask for an ex-

planation of how the gospel message of human responsibility and divine redemption is able to transform the cannibals of an entire island into law-abiding Christian citizens during one single generation, if these same savages be "impersonal" and possess moral consciousness only in germs that require time for development. These "non-moral impersonals" are either a marked exception to the method of the theory, or the messenger must be credited as being a miracle worker.

The human infant is considered as a type of the primitive man and described as "a non-moral animal in which the faculties of will and moral sense are made, not born. Experience begins in blank sensation and feelings of pleasure and pain. No animal species, indeed, is so slenderly furnished at birth with ready-made endowments; but none shows so great a receptivity and capacity for adaptation. Apart from the external educating environment, however, the child would remain on a level little superior to that of the brutes." This characterization of childhood may be essential to the evolution-

ist's conception of sin, but it is false to the facts and not necessary to the construction of a Christian theodicy. The "parental environment" is over-emphasized, while the personal endowments are almost wholly denied. He classifies them as really below the animal, and yet "in receptivity and capacity for adaptation" they evidence the fact that they belong to altogether another and higher species. The logic of the theory ought to make environment as beneficent in the case of an infant chimpanzee as in that of the babe born of Mother Gladstone.

The enforced attempt to credit every moral faculty to human evolution, rather than to divine endowment, has led to much strange and fictitious teaching. Evolution also insists that "fear and anger, envy and jealousy, self-centeredness and self-pleasing, are qualities which form a part of the birthright of the human being in virtue of his animal ancestry." These are all considered to be "natural, normal, and necessary." But we can not accept the assumed origin and nature of the above-named attributes and at

the same time consistently claim to accept the Christian fact of sin.

Sin as responsible violation of divine law is made void, and there remains only what may be called natural or physical evil. All the rhetorical utterances regarding moral evil and personal guilt become a meaningless travesty of words. Their own statement is that "the opportunity for sin is supplied by man's inherited organic nature and by his social environment, for neither of which he is in any wise responsible." A non-moral animal is supposed to evolve into a moral personality. Sin is born of a social environment, which, for the primitive man, at least, must have been non-existent.

An eminent authority, in writing on the subject of "Evolution and Christian Doctrine," makes the statement that "evolutionary science affords us absolutely no knowledge as to man's earliest consciousness of personal relation with God; and until we have historical or other evidence, we are at least as warranted in holding that, when man first stood forth as man, rational and re-

ligious, he found sin to consist in the deliberate disobedience to the known will of God, as in holding any other theory. The degree of crudence with which at the birth of his reason and freedom he conceived of God or law or disobedience, has nothing to do with the determination of the essential nature of sin. The doctrine of sin is not dependent on a theory of origin. It is not a question of a fall upward or downward, but of man's whole course of self-revelation."

The empirical theory of sin can not but be a disappointment to those who have other than a mere metaphysical interest in its existence. It is to be regretted that the influence of evolutionary science has not only been a lessening of individual responsibility for sin, but a corresponding depreciation of the supernatural in life. Sin has not only been given a new definition, but it has become, "either unconsciously or intentionally, something far less sinful in its relations to God and in man's conscious sense of guilt. The masses are specialists in the doctrine of experienced sin, which has been described

as a higher grade of being; but the resultant product does not substantiate the teaching of the theory." Aside from the work wrought through the power of divine regeneration and purification, we can point to no lessening of evil, nor to any examples of moral evolution.

In answer to the query as to "what bearing the theory of evolution has on the Christian doctrine of sin, Archdeacon Wilson made this reply: "Man fell when he first became conscious of the conflict of freedom and conscience. To the evolutionist sin is not an innovation, but is the survival or misuse of habits and tendencies that were incidental to an earlier stage of development. Their sinfulness lies in their resistance to the evolutionary and divine force that makes for moral development and righteousness. The fall from innocence was in a sense a rise to a higher grade of being." The Christian Scriptures, which constitute our most authoritative teaching on the doctrine of sin, are very emphatic in asserting that sin is an innovation, and that therein is centered the direst element of its criminality. We are

also informed that sin is against the divine statutes of a holy God, and not the mere interference with an evolutionary force. The highest point in the culpability of the sinner is found to be where his act touches the holiness of our personal Father.

One of the late writers on Evolution as a "New Theodicy" is Dr. George A. Gordon, who claims that "the temporary power man has to resist God is in consequence of the irrationality that he has brought up with him from the animal world, and therefore his character is semi-brutal." This view is similar to that of other evolutionists and is open to the same manifold objections. The statement produces the following dilemma: either the forces of man's higher life were in the animal life or they were not. If not, then man is not a man, but still a brute. If they were present, then the animal was never an animal, but always a man.

"Man can not be the mere outcome of natural law, and yet accountable for the fact that he is no better than he is. If he is only the child of nature, he must be entitled to the

privileges of nature. If he has come from matter alone, then he can not dwell within the shadow of a responsibility whose birthplace is elsewhere—in a different region altogether. And so the spirit of modern science is consistently non-Christian. A man who is nothing more than an aggregate of natural powers can have no true vision transcending the range of these powers. The Unseen, or a law coming forth from the Unseen to rule his spirit, must be a mere superstition to him, and sin, as the violation of such a law, a mere gloomy phantom, to be got rid of the best way he can.

"We must judge beginnings by endings, and not endings by beginnings. Evolution only shows what was the nature of the involution that went before. Nothing can come out that was not at least latently in the germ. I must interpret the acorn by the oak, not the oak by the acorn." Christian evolution is very similar to "Christian Science," in that it is neither "Evolution" nor "Christian." It is used as a mask for the theory in order that it may gain an entrance into the realm

of Theology. When entrance is once gained, the mask is of little importance. They use the Bible in much the same way as does Mrs. Eddy. They speak in glowing terms of "self-sacrifice" and the "everlasting reality of religion," but religion may come to mean little more than respectable paganism. They would clear the theological atmosphere of "the bats and owls of orthodoxy," and make room for the "beautiful and sublime discoveries with which the keen insight and patient diligence of modern students are beginning to be rewarded."

Evolution, even in the best of its varied forms, is open to serious objections. The chasm between human life and that of mere animals has never been bridged. The most that can be said is that it is merely a working hypothesis, having no claims upon the Christian system. The "theodicy" it offers may be "new," but it is sadly deficient in valid proof. We find that it is not in accord with the following tenets of the Christian system: the creation of man, and the origin of sin; the fall of man, and his redemption. The

moral responsibility of the individual is made of none effect, while the existence of sin is denied; the recognized authority of divine revelation is set aside, and the atonement becomes a meaningless tragedy.

Professor Wright in the "Bibliotheca Sacra" states that "the modern theory of evolution, which is so seriously affecting theological thought, is largely of the Spencerian variety and based upon deduction rather than induction. The web is like that of a spider which he spins wholly from his own bowels. It is a theory by this deductive, *a priori* process which constitutes the evolutionary fad of the present time and which is working such havoc and confusion in the thought of the age and leading so many into intellectual positions whose conclusions they dare not face and can not flank, and from which they can not retreat, except through a valley of humiliation, which to the unregenerate heart is worse than death." The above statement has had scores of fulfillments, but none more marked than that which London has just experienced in the case of R. J. Campbell, of

the City Temple. The Deity of Christ and the inspiration of the Bible were both sacrificed on the altar of an intolerant theory, born of an intellectual bias. In commenting on "The New Theology," Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll asserts that Mr. Campbell has for some time been minimizing sin and stating that God does not care whether we sin or not. "Sin is conceived to be merely an effort to find God."

"To the theologian who is familiar with the best scientific thought at the beginning of the twentieth century, it is humiliating to find that the cast-off clothing of the evolutionary philosophy of fifty years ago is now extensively being picked up and put on by many of the religious philosophers and Biblical critics of the day. The theory is a kind of car of juggernaut, for which way must be made, regardless of consequences." It is very evident that the liberals are far more intolerant in their dogmas of negation than even the extreme orthodox conservatives in their positive principles.

The best examples of this new orthodoxy

teach that "human progress is the gradual throwing off of the brute inheritance through struggle, so that by and by struggle will be needless. The ape and the tiger in human nature will become extinct. Original sin is nothing more nor less than the brute inheritance which every man carries with him, while the process of evolution is an advance toward true salvation." If this be true, then our ancestors were burdened with an undue portion of this so-called depravity. The completion of this "throwing-off process" will remove this so-called depravity and men will be born saints, and the atonement will no longer be a necessity even in the economy of those who teach the moral influence theory. *"True salvation"* is therefore no more nor less than the natural growth and development of the individual. This is a certain denial of sin and depravity. They may talk of suffering and misfortune, but it is inconsistent for them to use the Christian term "sin." They deal with *natural* evil under the assumed name of *moral* evil. It is impossible to harmonize Christianity with any such weak and

faulty conception of sin and redemption. There is great need of caution in accepting evolution even though it be robed in the garb of Theism.

Let us, in conclusion, compare the preceding statement with a well attested fact in Demonology. "Since Satan is confirmed in evil, sin is not necessarily a transient or remediable act of the will." Sin is not a stage in man's development from the brute creation. We can no longer regard it as "simply unripe good." There are those who are determined to continue in sin and who will not love God. If there is an eternal good, there must be an eternal sin for those who willfully continue in their rejection of God. "Men reach a state of character where it may be said that it would be morally impossible for them to choose evil, but this power was gained through long years of free choice. Men may also reach a state of confirmed wickedness when it seems impossible for them by any effort of their own or by the influence of outside help to be renewed again unto repentance."

We find it very difficult to harmonize these facts with Prof. Fiske's statement that "in the course of this wonderful evolution it becomes manifest that moral evil is simply the characteristic of the lower state of living as looked at from the higher. While profoundly real, its existence is only relative. In the process of our spiritual evolution evil must needs be present. But the nature of evolution also requires that it should be evanescent." This is only the echo of one of the vain hopes of Herbert Spencer, who after forty years of philosophic speculation confessed his failure to find any satisfaction outside the religion of Christ. How sin can be only a "misty unreality, and yet indispensable in man's spiritual evolution," is hard to understand. What a hopeful view and simple solution of the great problem of evil which has for centuries been an almost impenetrable mystery! How encouraging to think that, "in the higher stages, that which is worse than the best need no longer be positively bad!" What a consoling message for the man who is weighed down with the awful

consciousness of years of vice and sin, to tell him that "in the process of evolution he is entitled to *hope* that, as it approaches its goal and he comes nearer to God, the fact of evil will lapse into a mere memory, in which the shadowed past shall serve as a background for the realized glory of the present!" Man and God can retire and wait for evolution to do the work. Man does not need a Savior, but only time to evolve out of the remaining animalism. Dr. Raleigh says that, while Paul cried out in his deep consciousness of sin, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!" the modern philosopher, with his new ethics, exclaims boastfully, "O, progressive creature that I am, who shall help me to evolve myself!"

IV

THE FACT IN PHILOSOPHY

"God is as little the cause of evil as the current of the river is the cause which retards the movement of the boat."

—Leibnitz.

"Spinoza held evil to be a thing natural; vice as something not to be condemned, but to be explained. Evil was necessary because it was privative."

"Moral qualities reside not in actions, but in the agent who performs them, and that it is the spirit or motive from which we do any work that constitutes it the base, or noble, worldly or spiritual, secular or sacred."

—John Caird.

PHILOSOPHY

Science, philosophy, and theology comprise a trinity which ought to have unity. Science and philosophy need Christianity, and Christianity in turn needs them. We are certain that if Science be sincere in her search for truth, and Philosophy be true in her interpretation of phenomena, they must finally blend in harmony with Christianity—the possessor of Truth. A philosophy of religion is therefore not only desirable, but very possible. It will aid in preserving the unity of our fundamental doctrines, and enable us more fully to keep pace with the needs and demands of the modern trend of thought.

The question is often asked, "What place does sin hold in philosophy, and what has it contributed toward the solution of this great problem?" In our attempt to answer this query, let us first turn to Greece, which is to the philosopher what Judea is to the Chris-

tian. Here wisdom and culture gained their highest supremacy. However, God was not discovered through their wisdom, and morality remained at a low tide. The lives of the philosophers as well as the leaves of the classics were stained with immorality. They attempted to solve the problem of evil by taking refuge in the "wild hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls." When divine aid was within reach they still clung to the frail raft of human reason. They sought to humanize Deity, and as a result degraded both man and God. Evil became the excusable error of ignorance, and righteousness was only attainable through knowledge. Conscience at times seemed to have had an audible voice, and some heard and obeyed its message. Socrates sought to lift moral truth out of the slough of materialism. He emphasized personality and the pursuit of virtue, and presented sin in its relation to man. Plato attempted at a later date to present it in its twofold relation to man and God.

The Sophists were a scholarly class, who denied that there was any essential difference

between good and evil. Mental and moral faculties were accounted of no authority. "Right and wrong, virtue and vice, conscience and law and God were to them only imaginary fictions."

The Epicureans solved the problem by surrendering their reason to blind materialism. Moral obligation and character were alike impossible. Good was a mere expediency, and vice and immorality the natural outcome. Virtue had to them no intrinsic value.

The Stoics took life more seriously and taught the fulfillment of duty and the mastery of self. The question of evil was settled by saying that man was predestined to either good or evil, and for that reason could have no choice in the matter. Mortification and suppression of passion were substituted for elimination. They sought freedom from all the ills of life in a self-sufficiency which pretended to be absolute.

The philosophy of Epictetus taught the necessity of a kind of moral gymnastics. The aim was to bring the passions under the con-

trol of reason and to bring the will into harmony with the will of God. The true "ascetic" was the one who disciplined himself against all the suggestions of evil desire. "An object of desire comes into sight: wait, poor soul; do not straightway yield to it: consider the contest is great, the task is divine. Think of God: call Him to be your helper and to stand by your side." They opposed monastic "retreat," holding that everywhere a man will find the same hindrances within and without. True discipline was best attained in the crowd.

Epictetus held that "every object that is presented to the mind by either the senses or the imagination tends to range itself in ranks of either good or evil, and thereby to call forth desire or undesire: in most men this association of particular objects with the ideas of good or evil, and the consequent stirring of desire, is unconscious, being the result of education and habit. It is the task of the philosopher to learn to attach the idea of good to what is really good, so that desire shall never go forth to what is either un-

desirable or unattainable: this is right dealing with ideas."

The Greek philosopher held to divine law as being of nature and a part of the whole constitution of the world, while the Christian disciple founded morality on a divine command. The moral law was a positive enactment of God, and any breach of that law was sin, not against the constitution of Nature, but against the person of God. Dr. Hatch states that the one element was constant; *i. e.,* it was a trespass against God. On the one hand, it was something for which God must be appeased, and on the other hand, something which He could forgive. To the Stoics it was shortcoming, failure, and loss, and the chief sufferer was the man himself. Christianity agreed with most of the former and added that it was a crime against God.

Epictetus, in his answer to the inquiry, "What is our duty to Him?"—"It is simply to follow Him: to be of one mind with Him: to acquiesce in His administrations, and to say, with Socrates, 'If this be God's will, so be it.'" From such a testimony we can only

say that, if the writer failed to live a right life, the fault was not a conscious one, but due to some error in his interpretation of the will of God.

The Neo-Platonists explained the existence of evil by saying that "God is the author of all things except wickedness; the very nature of good presupposes its contrast evil, and the two are inseparable, like light and darkness—which may be called the argument from relativity; in the enormous extent of the universe something must be neglected; when evil happens to the good, it is not as a punishment, but as connected with a different dispensation; parts of the world may be presided over by evil demons; what we call evil may after all not be evil."

Descartes sought to reconcile the infinite perfection with free moral agency. He states that "before God sent us into the world He knew exactly what all the inclinations of our wills would be. God brings our volitions to pass; He wills them; they spring entirely from Him; but we are nevertheless free, because He constrains not our external actions,

nor does He compel us to do anything contrary to our wills."

Spinoza, in the wordy darkness of his metaphysical speculations, held that sin had its origin in the necessary limitation of finite being, or the contrast of individual life, as an inevitable stage in the development of man. A false monism comes in to take the place of Descartes' dualism. God becomes the author of evil, and man falls from the high plane of personal free agency to the low level of a mere automaton. Good and evil are accounted for as merely relative conceptions resulting from comparison. Sin therefore can not be positive, as nothing can happen contrary to God's sovereign will. Sin is negative and only a seeming reality. "With God there is no idea of evil," and sin is only a hindrance to the good.

Germany during the seventeenth century gave to the world the idealistic philosopher Leibnitz, who opposed Spinoza. In his "Theodicee" he attempts to show God's relation to the world as it is, and to justify the existence of evil without involving any con-

tradiction of aim. His moral optimism made it possible for him to believe this to be the best possible world. The best, because Omniscience chose it and created it. The best, because it made provision for the free agency of the individual. The best, because it made moral character a possibility. The best, because God is not made the author of evil, but that its origin as a reality comes through man's free will in his self-asserted defiance of God.

With all the above we may heartily agree, but when the claim is made that sin is a "*necessary possibility,*" then we decidedly disagree. This conclusion was forced upon him through his theory that the origin of sin was found in the "limitations of the finite." If he had explained human freedom as being a philosophical limitation, then the human will could have been held responsible; but to make the "limitation" general and the will merely an element in the necessitated possibility, is in a large degree to deny moral accountability. Had his philosophy permitted him to have regarded sin merely as a

"possibility," contingent on the power of "alternate choice," it would have greatly strengthened his entire argument. In his total theory we are forced to consider freedom as a servant of finite forces, when it should be the moral master of human destiny.

Evil is compared with the discords in a piece of music, which do not diminish its beauty, but only increase it through contrast. Man is sinful because he is finite. The limitations of his nature determine the existence of evil. He can not be infinite, therefore he is a sinner by creation. But our only inference can be, since God is the creator of man, He is also responsible for evil. The whole idea of sin as here expressed is weak and unsatisfactory and could never be made the basis of a sound Christian Theodicy.

The Hegelian doctrine of sin, as stated in his "Religio-philosophie," may be briefly summed up under four divisions:

1. "Evil exists as a metaphysical necessity. Man is essentially spirit, and spirit must oppose itself to naturalness and be free in order to raise itself out of its state of im-

mersion in nature and finally become reconciled with its own essence.

2. "As respects his *original condition,* man exists first in a state of pure naturalness. It can hardly be correct to term it a state of innocence, for if he did not know evil neither did he know good. In truth the first state was of mere existence in unity with nature, of rudeness, of appetite, and of barbarism generally. Man's animalism is neither good nor evil until touched by human consciousness and will.

3. "As to the essential nature of this state, man was by nature good and by nature bad. In the first place, he was created with the image of God. Secondly, he is evil because he is a natural being, and not wholly spiritual. The logic of his position would either rob Christ of His sinlessness or deprive Him of His humanity.

4. "Knowledge effected the transition from the natural to the moral state. Awakening consciousness brings man to recognize that he is not what he ought to be; hence arises the sense of sin. Man becomes evil by eating of the tree of knowledge. In this lies the connection of evil with knowledge. Knowledge acquaints man with the fact that his nature is not what it should be. It is not

that consideration (knowledge) has an eternal relation to evil, but the consideration itself is the evil. Evil is revealed by man's self-withdrawal from a condition of naturalness."

The contribution of Herbert Spencer toward the solution of the problem of evil is not of sufficient importance to justify any lengthy discussion. He may be classified as an agnostic evolutionist. Although he devoted many years to the construction of a new theory of ethics and morals, it proved of small value to philosophy and of scanty satisfaction to himself. His synthetic system of philosophy was constructed on the basis of assumed hypotheses, and, though prolific in the collation of facts and phenomena, was false in many of its conclusions.

The moral system, as well as man's sense of moral obligation, was considered the product of human experience and education. Conduct was merely the adjustment of means to ends, and might vary from "simple imperfect to relatively complete adaptations." Personal acts are ranked as good or evil, ac-

cording as they satisfy or fail to satisfy the requirements of the individual or the system. That which is now considered moral is only a developed form of that which was once immoral. There is an absence of any authority above that which one individual in society might bear toward another. The determinative elements in the characterization of conduct are such as to preclude any worthy conception of the fact of sin.

He used plenty of capital letters, but they were apparently for the purpose of avoiding final issues, and in reality they reveal the weakness of his philosophy. It is impossible for any individual to trace any moral problem to an adequate cause without inevitably facing God. This Mr. Spencer would not do, and so took refuge in what he chose to designate the "unknown Cause" or the "unrealized Reality."

"The continuous adjustment of internal relations to external environments" constitutes in the thought of Mr. Spencer the whole of life. The individual is being adapted to the newly evolved society. The effort neces-

sary to the attainment of this "ideal congruity" is causal to the existence of the moral sense. The individual is denied the endowment of any moral ideas or faculty, and is the superstitious subject of an unknown Force. It is essential to the completeness of his theory that he shall have a "primitive man" in harmony with the needs of the case. "This man," says a critic, "is a purely imaginative creature, made in *his* study and after the image of its creator." If we are willing to grant our philosopher special license in the use of analogy and inference, then we must be ready to receive every sort of conjectured conclusions. It is too evident to require any special proof that his references to various races and widely varying religions are not only lacking in necessary discrimination, but they are false to the facts.

In his synthetic philosophy there is to be found no word that either gives recognition to the ideas that have made man or to the persons which have most splendidly and effectually embodied them.

In the idealistic philosophy of Borden P. Bowne the moral life is made the analogue of the mental life. He criticises the English moralists for having generally confused the question as to the origin of the moral idea with that of validity, a process which has resulted either in reducing it to something else or in making it primitive and irreducible. The aim in both instances he regards as ethically irrelevant. "The validity and value of this moral idea can not be determined by the place of its first appearance, since the validity is quite another thing from the emergence of the idea." He remarks that "in the search for the origin of moral consciousness even the brute world has been sharply scanned, and the bearing of flogged curs has been invested with deep significance."

In a reference to the evolutionary doctrine of ethics he has this significant word: "How that which is essentially and only brute can become anything else, or how the brute which has transcended itself still remains the identical brute — these questions are undreamed of. Both assumptions involve a

contradiction. In the former case they affirm groundless development, and in the latter case they deny the development while affirming it."

The author states as his settled conviction that the pretended deduction of moral ideas *from* non-moral data and *to* non-moral elements are both purely verbal and fictitious. The center of character he locates in the will to do right. This is possible to every one and in all circumstances. With it every one can make a beginning and "all may meet on the plane of common faithfulness." "The ignorant, the poor, the savage, the imbecile, may be faithful to their ideal of right; and thereby win the approval of all moral beings." This does not, however, make them sinless or perfect, but makes it possible for them to have a right attitude toward righteousness, which is "an essential element in all moral development."

The will is made the determinative force in the choice of good or evil, but it is insufficient when taken as a basis of character. We have pointed out to us the two essentials in

ethical judgment: "the moral ideal and the moral ability of the individual." "From the standard of the ideal all are condemned, but from the side of *ability* the question is very different." This statement requires that we supplement it by the formerly stated conditions of the will.

In morals, what we are is of greater value than what we do. The outward result of our sin may be largely corrected, but the heart-condition of the sinner lies too deep for human treatment. "The moral ideal binds us not only in our social relations, but also in our self-regarding activities and thoughts. The crimes of sense and passion are sins against humanity, not in the persons of others, but in the persons of the agents themselves." It is difficult for us to know exactly where "self-regard ends and selfishness begins, where firmness becomes obstinacy and meekness pusillanimity." The moral life is of the whole man and begins as a potentiality, rather than an actuality.

This is widely different from the usual empirical explanation. In our *potential* man

even at infancy we have room for divinity. We thereby save the moral faculty from degradation, and draw a distinct line of separation between man and every grade of animal existence. God gives direction and potentiality to primitive as well as present humanity, and the Christian position is made secure. The animal, being endowed with no potentiality, but only with mechanical instinct, has no self-development or progress. In man, possessing potentiality, with added free spirit, "the constitutional becomes moral and the natural rises to the plane of the spiritual." In the moral sphere, as contrasted with the physical, instead of blind beneficence we have productive good will, and in place of natural evil we have moral evil.

For twenty-five centuries Philosophy has been laboring with the Problem of Evil. Thales and his coadjutors in the fifth and sixth centuries before Christ applied materialism. Socrates and Plato sought refuge in Idealism. Modern Philosophy began with the Dualism of Descartes and the Pantheism of Spinoza, and has risen gradually to the

Monotheism of Lotze and the Theism of McCosh and Bowne.

Neither the pantheism of Spinoza, nor the idealism of Leibnitz, nor the absolute idealism of Hegel, nor the positivism of Comte, nor the evolution of Spencer, has been able to satisfy the human mind and conscience. The fault has not been with philosophy, but with the philosopher. He has never been able to escape "necessity." The fact that evil exists has been taken as conclusive evidence that therefore it is something which ought to exist. Kant and Schiller regard evil as a necessary part of the transition of reason from a state of nature to that of culture. In the greater part of their speculations they have overlooked the plans and purposes of the Infinite and viewed the present condition of the world, not as a result of man's sin, but rather as a product of the divine will. Philosophy needs a vision of God before it can ever properly interpret man and nature. The province of philosophy says one "is not to dwell in caves, lit up by the feeble torchlights of the senses, but to

seek the transfigured heights of truth, and, discovering the long-lost and long-sought knowledge, pilot the race through the avenues of darkness to the jeweled throne of God.'' The twentieth century is illustrative of the widely welcome fact that, while Christianity is gradually becoming philosophic, philosophy is rapidly becoming Christian.

V

THE FACT IN THE ETHNIC FAITHS

"The good man is serene, the bad always in fear."
—Confucius.

"The very essence of life is evil, and in order to escape from being we must escape equally from merit and demerit."
—Buddha.

"Righteousness is not that ye turn your faces toward the east or the west; but righteous is, one who believes in God, and the last day, and the angels, and the Book, and the prophets." —The Koran.

THE ETHNIC FAITHS

Con-science precedes science. Ideas precede actions. The origin of sin is philosophical, while the existence of sin is historical. Before men wrote, God had written. The Egyptian hieroglyphics inscribed on tablets of clay and stone are but the imperfect translations of the divine law written on the "fleshly tables" of men's hearts. The sense of right and wrong is not of recent origin, but primal. It is not a universal acquirement, but a divine endowment. Before the thunderings of Sinai and the accusing message of the prophet there was a still small voice which communed with the hearts of men. In every age the divine element in man has been seeking expression, but, like the shaded stalk that awaits the sun and shower, it lacked the life-giving rays of the Sun of Righteousness. Lamb taught that man was "an archangel slightly damaged," while Milton said, "A

good man was the ripe fruit our earth holds up to God."

"In the beginning God" is the limit of the theologian and the scientist. In ethics, as in nature, the dawn may be even more beautiful than the noontide, although in utility the latter is of far more importance. "Ethics," says Dr. Peabody, "is a sign-post on the way to religion. The interpretation of the teaching of Jesus in terms of ethics leads, as it were, to a threshold which the Teacher crosses to enter a room of which ethics has no key, and of which *He* says: 'I am the door.' The relation of ethics to Christianity is that of the part to the whole. It is preliminary to that fuller revelation of law and duty we find in Christian revelation." Our hasty review of the early ethical systems may serve as a preparation for the more complete and higher revelation which is to follow. Like the historian and the archeologist, we may be allowed to visit the caves and catacombs in our search for evidence.

In this survey we are not limited to any

one age, language, or race, but we turn to all ages, all languages, and all races, and exclaim, "These are God's people!" The fountain, we believe, was pure. The distinction between right and wrong is eternal, but revealed knowledge is needed to enable man to make the proper classification of things which are right and wrong. All men have the former, but only a part have the latter. Conscience is not the infallible oracle of God, but it is to man's moral and spiritual life what hunger is to the physical well-being of humanity. It is possible to keep it normal and healthy and also possible for man to sear and harden it, so that it becomes abnormal and untrustworthy. Thus we have an explanation of the condition and customs of primitive man.

The present conception of sin is not a product of evolution, but the result of an inner revelation. Could we go back far enough, we would find not polytheism, but monotheism; not a fetich, but a Being of whom the fetich was only the outward symbol. We would find not impurity, but purity. The

true must exist before the counterfeit. Virtue *must* precede vice. God in times past spoke in divers manners, and all men are in some degree expressions of God's truth. The poet's imagination aids the preacher's delivery. The artist with his canvas and brush instructs the eye as the orator does the intellect. The musician reaches the ethical through the æsthetic. God in some mysterious way is blending all the discords of science and religion. The astronomer gladly welcomes the light of the Sun of Righteousness. The botanist finds his highest ideal in the Rose of Sharon. The geologist's grandest achievements center in the Rock of Ages. So we may some day find that, out of all the discordant elements in science and religion God can bring a divine harmony.

The fact of sin is not in any way invalidated by a review of the false conceptions and attempted solutions which the non-Christian systems have formulated. On the contrary, we are led to approach it from varied viewpoints. In our search for the origin of ethics we go back as far as the fourth dynasty

and find ourselves on the banks of the historic Nile—the "wonderland" of the Egyptian. On the still surface of this life-giving stream, where in ages past floated "the gilded barge of Cleopatra;" before the water of the Nile was turned into blood or Jacob had visited Thebes,—these ancient people were in possession of an extensive ethical code. Dr. R. W. Rogers claims that these Egyptians were doubtless indebted to the Babylonians for much of their civilization.

Professor A. H. Sayce in his "Hibbert Lectures" states the Babylonian conception of evil very concisely in these words: "The divine powers worshiped had once been alike the creators of good and the creators of evil; like the powers of nature which they represented, they had been at once beneficent and malevolent. By degrees the two aspects of their character came to be separated. The higher gods came to be looked upon as the hearers of prayer and the bestowers of all good gifts, while the suffering and evil came from the inferior spirits of the lower sphere. But the old conception, which derived both

good and evil from the same source, did not wholly pass away. Evil never came to be regarded as the direct antagonist of good; it was rather the necessary complement and minister of good. The supreme Baal thus preserved his omnipotence, while at the same time the ideas of pain and injustice were dissociated from him. They believed nature had a harmful side, from which came destructive wind and storms, injustice and evil."

The ethics of the Egyptians are of an unusually high order for such an early period. "Whether or not they worshiped sacred animals, one thing is certain and incontestable, that the essential element of the Egyptian religion was man and his destiny. Let us not think that their religion was merely an atheistic philosophy, like Buddhism. No; the Egyptian believed in God, and also, on the same ground, in the immortality of the human soul, and that the guilty alone would be punished in the other world." Their ethical code of confession is found in the following brief sentences:

1. I have not been unjust.
2. I have not stolen.
3. I have not acted a lie.
4. I have not committed adultery or any impure act.
5. I have not blasphemed God.
6. I have not debased God in my heart.
7. I have not cursed my father.
8. I have not used haughty words.
9. I have not killed any man by treason.
10. There is no fraud in my heart.

In a study of the sacred books we find that they were familiar with a rule of right living, called "MAAT." The word is of frequent occurrence and signifies "a perfectly straight and inflexible rule." It is from the root "MA," meaning "to stretch out," and, like our word *right,* has reference primarily to law and order. "MAT," says Renouf, "is law, not in the forensic sense of command issued either by human sovereign authority or by divine legislation, like the law of the Hebrews, but in the sense of the unerring order which governs the universe, whether in its physical or in its moral aspect." This,

he asserts, is a great and noble conception. In the Book of the Dead we have an account of one, of whom it was said: "He was the protector of the humble, a palm of abundance to the destitute, food to the hungry and the poor, largeness of heart to the weak. That which the great God hath done to him, that had He done to others."

Rhys Davies says: "The triumph of right over wrong is the burden of nine-tenths of the Egyptian texts which have come down to us. Right is represented as a goddess ruling over heaven and earth and the world beyond the grave." It is clearly seen in their references to piety, charity, chastity, gentleness, and self-command in word and act, that they were attempting to express an inner idea of morality, which must have been divinely implanted and was purer and higher than many of the later heathen cults.

Hinduism is the all-embracing system of Indic religions. This cult goes back to the early VEDAS, about the year 1500 B. C. A part of their writings were thought to be inspired. We find that these sacred books

teach the eternity of the soul and of matter. They also hold to a peculiar union of the soul and body which results in bondage. This bondage is escaped only through transmigration, which is the root of all evil. Evil is overcome by indifference and absorption, the only true end of life. Existence is always evil, and non-existence is the highest good. This principle would logically preclude their possessing any vital moral life.

The harmony of existing evil and God's justice is accounted for in the Vedanta system by saying that He was not independent of pre-existing conditions and that He found His material affected by former sins. The infinite soul being the real author of all our acts, we are thereby not responsible for wrong action. Though Hinduism is theistic and was at first monotheistic, and while the Aryan account of the creation and of man's fall bears some resemblance to that of the Bible, still it possesses no Savior and no true conception of sin. Diet affects the whole moral and religious character. What a man eats is to them the index to his character.

The five great sins include "the drinking of spirituous liquors, killing a Brahman, stealing gold from a Brahman, adultery with the wife of a religious teacher, and the association with any one guilty of these crimes." At best this is a very superficial and narrow conception of even natural evil. The absence of any spiritual vision of the inner life as contrasted with the rules of external conduct rendered them incapable of knowing the real content of sin.

About six centuries before the advent of the world's great Teacher with His "glad tidings of peace on earth and good will to men," when all China was in confusion and disorder, when men were immersed in transcendentalism, there appeared in the Celestial Empire a man named Confucius, who said to the people, "I show you a more excellent way." Present duty, the pathway to future glory, was the keynote of this new moral harmony. "A transforming power," says Mencius, "went abroad. Dishonesty and dissolution hid their heads. Loyalty and good faith became the characteristics of men, and

chastity and teachableness that of the women." Right living was to honor your ancestors. Salvation was to be gained through good citizenship. The five cardinal virtues of Confucius were expressed in the following words: Benevolence, duty, decorum, knowledge, and faith.

Twenty-five centuries of almost stagnant life can alone give us any proper valuation of such principles when they rest on human standards and depend on purely subjective practice. We hear much said in praise of the golden rule which Confucius gave to his people. It is stated as follows: "What you do not like when done to yourself, do not that to others." This we are compelled to classify as a narrow and selfish rule of life. Negation is not virtue, nor does it imply sinlessness. Such a command is unworthy of comparison with the Christian Golden Rule, which requires a definite, positive life of self-sacrifice in behalf of the needy and helpless. One prohibits certain forms of wrongdoing, while the other commands losing one's life in service for others. Their lack of any

other ideal except that which is merely human, opens the way for universal oppression and injustice. Having no true idea of virtue and holiness, it was impossible for them to have any doctrine of sin, or to feel any conscious need of a Savior.

From the Dead Sea of China's ancestral idolatry we turn to Persia and find the religion of Zoroaster. This was the faith of the immortal Cyrus and Xerxes. The central thought is dualism, and a modern and modified form of this teaching still exists. The conflict between right and wrong is represented by two gods—Ormuzd, the good, and Ahriman, the evil-minded; but above this division of good and evil is an eternal primitive being, Zeruane akerene, in which both principles have their origin. Men are taught to hate the evil as the good soldier does the banner of his foe.

Loathe sin; abhor sin; go not near it, preaches the Sufi.

"Avoid an evil doer as you would a brand,
Which, lighted, burns; extinguished, soils the hand."

The code of morals consists of four laws:

Piety, consisting chiefly in the worship of Ormuzd by a repetition of hymns and prayers.

Purity—"Pure thoughts, pure words, and pure deeds." They had a moral and a legal purity. Their idea of the former was similar to the Christian view, embracing even the secret thoughts of the heart.

Veracity. The crowning virtue of the Persians was truthfulness.

Industry. The cultivation of the soil was looked upon as a solemn religious duty, and an individual's character was estimated by his devotion to work as well as worship.

We find in this system a short account of the fall of man. "Yima, the first man, dwelt in a happy paradise. The serpent of Ahriman lied to him and effected his ruin. As a result the whole condition of the earth was changed and all men came under the power of evil. The majesty of the heavens passed away in the form of a bird."

The Persian was taught to hate evil and to love the good for its own sake. They also

had a materialistic notion of the resurrection, which some have attempted to explain as the source of the Jewish doctrine. While Zoroaster was a monotheist, he based his religion on philosophic instead of revealed truth. The origin of sin is not attributed to God in this system, but the nature and seat of evil are both out of accord with the Christian view. The optimistic declaration that the good will eventually triumph over the evil is in a general sense true to the Bible teaching.

Buddhism came before us as an offshoot of Brahmanism and as a protest against its corruptions. It was about the year 500 B. C. that a man of a melancholy disposition, sick of pleasure, and saddened by the world's sin and distress, left his home to seek consolation in asceticism. Six years of self-mortification and persistent effort to rid himself of all vain desires gave him the victory, and out from under the "Bo Tree" he started on a journey to teach his new doctrine, which included:

(*a*) The fact of sorrow;

(*b*) The cause of sorrow;

(*c*) The removal of sorrow by the destruction of desire.

According to Spence Hardy, the Buddhist traditions mention a fall of man. "When certain former worlds were destroyed, a colony of supernatural men were placed upon the earth. They lived without need of food and could fly through the air. They lived for ages in peace. At length they ate a substance (a scum) found on the surface of the earth, and thenceforth knew good and evil and fell to the earthly condition."

In addition to this account of man's fall they mention an inborn element (Trishma) of desires tending to lead men to evil. This is a misfortune resulting from a former state and bears some analogy to our inherited depravity.

"The doing" (Kharma) is a man's "record," the consequences and liabilities of his acts. One man's guilt passes over to some new-born babe or animal which is entirely innocent, yet this is held to be a necessary requirement of eternal justice. This new be-

ing has no knowledge or memory of the preceding life, and does not even know for what sins he suffers, nor whose they were. Buddhism claims that all punishment has a corrective character, and this is involved in "the monstrous cruelty and injustice of the doctrine of transmigration."

The Buddhist decalogue comprises the following moral precepts:

1. Thou shalt not kill.
2. Thou shalt not steal.
3. Thou shalt not lie.
4. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
5. Thou shalt not get drunk.

The above apply to all men.

6. Thou shalt not offend in diet.
7. Thou shalt not indulge in amusements.
8. Thou shalt not use ornaments or perfume.
9. Thou shalt not sleep on luxurious beds.
10. Thou shalt not have silver or gold.

The last five pertain only to religious orders.

These are common maxims of morality, but they lack the recognition of God and the idea of sin against Him. We find here no reference to the inner life of the transgressor. They speak of errors and acts of injustice toward man, but they can have no deep conception of evil because they have no true idea of God. They subdivide the ten sins of their system into the three following divisions:

Those of the body—

1. Taking life.
2. Theft.
3. Unlawful sexual intercourse.

Those of speech—

1. Lying.
2. Slander.
3. Abuse—swearing.
4. Vain conversation.

Those of the mind—

1. Covetousness.
2. Malice.
3. Skepticism. This means to deny everything in this world and the next, the Buddha and the law, the

effect of moral causes, birth, transmigration and the existence here or hereafter.

Thus far have these human philosophers struggled with the problem of evil, but neither Buddha, nor Zoroaster, nor Confucius, nor Gautama, has been successful in the attempt to formulate a rational theodicy.

We enter the seventh century with Christianity victorious over nearly all her enemies in the Eastern empire. About the year 622 there appeared a new factor in the religious world—"a power which would threaten the whole fabric of civilization and change the map of the known world." Arabia issued from her obscurity. Mecca became the center of a new religious idea, centering in the life of Mohammed, the prophet of Allah. This new teacher claimed to have received his doctrines as a divine revelation. He preached a system of salvation from sin peculiar to the Koran. "Man consists of a material part, the body; and an immaterial part, the soul. The soul, being the active principle, is that which desires good and

evil." The seat of sin is therefore not in the flesh alone. The sense of sin is aroused experimentally. It was this that drove Mohammed to the cave of Hira. "When he found assurance he found it in the sense of pardon."

The fact of sin and ill-desert was not thereby abolished, it was rather established. The thought of the judgment took strong hold on him, just because he so strongly realized the fact of sin in himself. What he experienced in himself he observed in others. The call to preach, of which he was so vividly conscious, was based upon the conviction that his contemporaries were in sin and under the wrath of God. But it should be understood that "sin was not the essence of his hell, nor holiness a characteristic of his heaven." It is thought that Mohammed's doctrine of the universality of sin was based largely on his personal experience.

We find in the Koran several accounts of the fall of man. "The Garden of Paradise, where Adam and his wife were created, was heaven. God commands the angels to bow

down to Adam as His vicegerents. All obey except Iblis, who refuses on the ground that Adam is his inferior. Iblis is then expelled from the garden because of his arrogance, but is permitted to become the tempter of man. Adam and his wife are commanded not to eat of one tree in the garden, and are warned against the wiles of Satan. Nevertheless Satan causes them to disobey, and both tempter and tempted are cast down to earth to live in mutual enmity until the final day of doom."

This embodies Mohammed's theory of the origin of sin. It was to him a very simple matter—sin is disobedience to the commands of God. There is an implied organic transmission of sin, or at least a tendency toward evil. Sin finds its origin in the conflict of the natural desires of men and the command of God. Salvation from sin must come through faith in Allah, or certain judgments would follow in the life to come. The Calvinism of this system is very marked. Mohammed had a high notion of God's sovereignty, but a false notion of man. Evil as

well as good comes by the appointment of God. He creates the soul and "breathes into it its wickedness and piety. He misleadeth whom He will, and guideth whom He will." Human freedom is denied and sin is merely an expression of that which has been divinely necessitated.

The value of these crude systems is largely in their indirect relation to the Christian conception of sin as revealed in the New Testament writings. They prove that in all men and in all ages there has existed a distinction between good and evil and a dominant desire for some means of escape from the certain results of guilt and sin.

VI

THE FACT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

"The thought of his heart was only evil continually."

—Moses.

"Against Thee and Thee only have I sinned and done this evil."

—David.

"To obey is better than sacrifice."

—Samuel.

"A new heart also will I give you."

—Ezekiel.

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Fact of Sin finds its deepest and clearest expression in the total teaching of the Bible. Any view that discards either of the dispensations is incomplete and unsatisfactory. It is a large step from pagan philosophy to divine revelation. "Sin," says Principal Fairbairn, "is a religious term intelligible only in the realm of religious experience and thought. 'Evil' is a philosophical term, and denotes every condition, circumstance, or act that in any manner or degree interferes with complete perfection or happiness of being, whether physical, metaphysical, or moral. 'Vice' is an ethical term; it is moral evil interpreted as an offense against the ideal or law given in the nature of man. 'Crime' is a legal term and denotes the open or public violation of law which a society or State has framed for its own preservation and the protection of its members.

Sin differs from all these in this respect: they may be in a system which knows no God, but without God there can be no sin." God has spoken to *us* through His Son, but in times past through prophets and holy men, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. "Throughout the Old Testament we can trace an increasing moral sensitiveness, a conviction of sin that becomes more acute and painful as the manifestations of God's holiness grow more distinct. It becomes a personal affront to God. Its loathesomeness in His sight, its defilement disqualifying the man for God's service and making him tremble and cower in God's presence, are realized by the Hebrew conscience with piercing vividness."

All through the Old Testament sin is pictured in the crimson and scarlet tint of God's judgments against disobedience, but when we come to the New Testament love portrays its awfulness in the vicarious atonement of the Son of God. "The Old Testament," says Fuller, "will still be a New Testament to him who comes with a fresh de-

sire for information." The question of an inspired revelation is not the basis of our Christian living, but our Christian living becomes our best apology for the inspiration of Scripture. On the human side sin needs to be explained at every moral level, but on the divine side Truth is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. God's laws which govern nature never change, but man's knowledge of them advances. The Infinite is constantly compelled to repeat in regretful reserve, "I have many things to say unto you, but you can not bear them now." We shall interpret the teaching of the Old Testament not by what men do, but by what God says. The sincere student of the Word will not only find *human imperfection,* but a richness of *divine perfection* in the Old Testament Scripture.

The first example we have of sacrificial gifts and worship is that of Cain and Abel. Why does God reject one offering and accept the other? The answer is found in the statement that He demands "not sacrifice, but obedience." Sin croucheth at the door of

him who doeth not well. God looked at the character behind the offering. Then, as now, the spirit of the giver determines the value of the gift. Obedience as an expression of the inner life constitutes the unchanging standard of acceptance and rejection.

The sin of Sodom consisted in the exceeding sinfulness of the individual before the Lord. He is not only faulty before men and nations, but guilty in the sight of a holy God who sanctions no immorality in the extension of His kingdom. We find in the sixth verse of the twentieth chapter of Genesis that adultery is spoken of, not merely as a physical evil, but in the heart of the individual it becomes a crime against Him who takes knowledge not only of the external conduct, but of the inner life and motives.

The writer in Exodus speaks of a sin which was not only against Aaron, but was a great sin against the Lord. Plagues in Egypt, and milk and honey in Canaan, are only secondary results of sin and righteousness. Individuals were led away from the

thought of mere external action to the deeper inward reality of evil.

In Leviticus we would naturally expect to find sin represented only as a ceremonial uncleanness and wholly external in its character. But while the outward act may measure the imperfect conceptions of men, yet God, whether in speaking to the whole "congregation," to a "ruler," or to one of the "common people," He always traced the act to a divine command and to an inner guilt.

In the following passage from Deuteronomy we have an approach to Paul's teaching as to unavailing circumcision. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart." They were to serve not men, but the Lord, and to have the source of all their acts in the heart.

Achan answered Joshua and said, "Indeed I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel." This is a conception of sin worthy of the New Testament revelation. It is counted a personal violation of divine law which brings a deep consciousness of guilt. We can easily postulate the fact from this

verse that "sin is personal and the sinner without excuse."

In Samuel we read that "when one man sinned against another they might find a mediator, but when a man sinned against the Lord there was no person able to do this." Certainly we have here a very clear conception of the deep-dyed taint of sin. No sacrifice and no earthly judge was equal to the task. Have we not here a conception of the need of an atoning Christ?

When we come to the "sweet singer" of Israel we find presented not only a high standard of national righteousness, but perhaps the highest conception of personal purity found anywhere in the Old Testament. In the Fifty-first Psalm the writer's deep conviction and true repentance find expression in the words: "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned and done this evil in Thy sight. Create *in me* a clean heart and renew a right spirit *within me.*"

Amos, the first great prophet-preacher in the Northern kingdom, used the word transgression very frequently when speaking of

the different nations. He portrays their "mighty sins" and then gives the message of the Lord, "Seek me and live."

The prophecy of Isaiah presents a high ideal of purity and anticipates the New Testament notion of sin and guilt. The author lays down certain principles that are worthy of a place in gospel teaching. Sacrifices are mockery to God when offered by evil men. Purity must precede prayers and acceptable service. Blood-red and scarlet sins may all be made white as snow. There is no Calvinistic teaching, but the wider welcome that says, "whosoever will" may come and be saved. Severe and certain judgment is reserved for all unrepentant sinners. Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts. His glory is the fullness of the whole earth. They were enabled to grasp the true nature of sin because of the completeness of their conception of the holiness of Him against whom all sin is committed. All men, in the language of the Hebrew text, are "chatath;" *i. e.*, they have all come short of possible obedience and missed the mark. But the poor

marksmanship and the stumbling in the race were self-induced failures, and for that reason God designated them as sins, and man's innate sense of obligation approved the verdict.

We are safe in saying that "Truth is truth since God is God," and can never, in any age or with any people, be anything else. Truth finds its unity in the immutability of the absolute, and while this is true, yet God measures men by motives as well as by acts. The schoolmaster (law) must accommodate his methods to his pupils. The people must first gain some knowledge of the *nature* of sin and feel a sense of need, that the way may be prepared for the redemption fom sin.

Imperfect subjects can not render perfect *service,* but they may have perfect *motives* and a complete consecration. The Mosaic legislation is not equal to the Sermon on the Mount. The prophecy of Isaiah may not be of equal value with the Gospel of John. The preaching of Amos may appear to us to be inferior to that of Paul. But the relative consecration and service was as complete

for that age as ours is for this present century. Then, as now, sin was heart-crime against God. Talents and times may differ, but the degree of faithfulness required by the Lord remains the same. The Christian in the coming century may come a little nearer God's ideal for man, but error will never become truth, nor disobedience obedience. The sad undertone of sin is no less a part of life now than in times past.

In a study of Bruce's "Ethics of the Old Testament" we gain the following conclusions which seem to be drawn from the life which the Book produces, aside from the failure of man to grasp the full meaning of God:

The ethical principles were always receiving new developments under divine guidance.

Israel rose to higher and higher "platforms of ethics," while surrounding nations remained at the lowest level of morality.

The life lived under the Mosaic rule was a life of restraint and obedience to an external law.

The law fulfilled two purposes: brought

about and maintained a theocratic union between God and the nation. Law entered that the offense might abound.

In both pro-Exilic and post-Exilic writing righteousness is praised as above all law and ceremony.

Ezekiel and Daniel are not exceptions, as some claim. Ritualism was to them not a matter of place and time, but of heart and conscience.

The moral ideal of the prophets is always a lofty one. We find here the prophetic picture of the golden age, when the Law was to be written on the heart; the righteous king was to execute justice on the earth; the stony heart was to be taken away and a new spirit put within them. There was to be a great national regeneration, and righteousness would flow down the streets like streams of water. The historic realization of all this is to be found in Jesus Christ. It could not be accomplished by the Law; but the Law was the "pedagogue" to lead men to Christ. The dark night of legalism must necessarily precede the dawning of the Sun of Righteousness.

VII

THE FACT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

"Sin is the transgression of the Law."

—John.

"Sin is not imputed where there is no Law."

—Paul.

"To him therefore that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." —James.

"The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins."

—Jesus.

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Christian idea of sin has its real genesis in the life of the Son of God. The darkness of evil deepens as the light of Christ is revealed. He came not to make void the legalism of the Old Testament, but to fulfill it. God remains the same, but man enters on a new spiritual plane. The new revelation brought new responsibilities, but did not release men entirely from the old ones. It was still necessary for the divine teacher to state, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now." Law still determines lawlessness, and love of purity demands justice in dealing with impurity. In our study of the New Testament we find sin expressed in at least three phases, or relations, and for convenience the passages will be classified under these divisions.

Law, when viewed in its relation to God's

sovereignty, loses its legal phase, and through its universality it becomes moral. We find a marked distinction between the common lawbreaker who transgresses the law, not out of any real hatred to the law in itself, but for gain and self-gratification; and the man who rebels against authority because he hates the whole principle of law and government. The first instance is merely that of the common thief who loves money, while the other one is that of the bold and defiant anarchist. The latter's action is the expression of an utter contempt for all law, regardless of the holiness and justice of the lawgiver. We find such a status of life expressed in the Greek word "anomia." This may be interpreted as a form of selfishness which expresses itself in hatred of God as well as of man.

Sin in a forensic sense may be defined as non-conformity to divine law. It is proper to state in this connection that there is a divine element in statute law and also in the laws of nature. But law in the sense in which Paul uses it has at least three func-

tions. It is, first of all, the measuring line ("parabasis"), which determines the extent of our transgression. The natural man opposes law, and in that case it tends to provoke transgression. The third function is preventive, in that it aids man to avoid evil. Paul would have us understand that there must be a law before there can be transgression, or "a going-over." We do not all sin after the likeness of Adam's transgression, yet we all sin.

Sin was in the world before the law, but sin is not imputed (reckoned) where there is no law. Law does not in any sense create sin, but it marks the line and warns us against crossing over it. It is the mirror of divine holiness, which reflects the distorted image of the transgressor, contrasting the true image of Him whose likeness we bear. By steadfastly beholding ourselves in it we are changed from character to character. We are to compare our marred image with the true likeness of Christ's sinlessness as the artist compares and retouches the imperfect painting, having constantly before him a per-

fect ideal. "If we reject," says Müller, "the distinction between moral integrity and moral perfection, and maintain that there is no difference between opposition to law and non-conformity to law, it follows that we must also reject every gradational distinction of moral goodness."

Knowledge of the law and consciousness of transgression are among the necessary antecedents of guilt and sin. No law in this system means no transgression, and no transgression implies no sin. The real sinner is not a man without the law, but a man under it and rebelling against it. Trench claims that "the original law and revelation of the right preceded the Mosaic law and is written on the hearts of all, and as this in no human heart is completely obliterated, all sin, even of the savage, must in a secondary sense be a violation of this older though partially obscured law."

In the First Epistle of John he speaks of sin as "the transgression of the law." The word is here used not figuratively, not as a concrete action, but as an abstract prin-

ciple. Sin is a condition from which come acts of transgression. A man may commit but two transgressions during a day, yet he is a sinner during the whole intervening time, and continues in that state until he seeks forgiveness. We may transgress a law which refers to our neighbor or one directly related to God, yet in the last analysis the acts are both against God. Sin in the higher analysis is not so much a transgression of law as an act of disobedience against the will of our Heavenly Father. It has to do with a living will as well as a divine law.

The law in the Christic sense is a spiritual ideal, "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow"—"a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." The law extends even into the inner chamber of the heart and reveals the secret transgressions of thought and inclination. Love is the fulfilling of the law, but willful transgression is enmity against God.

While sin is a unit in its real nature, yet

it has special manifestations and relations. Dr. Curtis, in his volume entitled "The Christian Faith," gives three definitions of personal sin: "Theologically it is responsible lawlessness in self-decision, ethically it is a self-conscious violation of the moral judgment, while practically it may be termed selfishness." This is merely a statement of the same thing as it may be viewed by different individuals. We are aware of the fact that the twelve or more words which are used by the Biblical writers often occur interchanged, but they still have individual meanings which are frequently expressed by New Testament writers. There are three words that are most commonly used in personal relations. The best example of this subjective reference is the word "hamarita." This word refers to the inability which prevents the attainment of some required aim or object set before us, rather than the rightness or wrongness of the aim or object in itself. The latter is defined by other words which refer directly to the moral character of the motive and the action.

Paul states that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." In this passage the word "death" *may* be taken to include physical, spiritual, and eternal death. The word "sin" occurs more than one hundred and fifty times in the New Testament, and usually refers to the nature and state of the sinner who by outward and inward acts of transgression has placed himself under condemnation. In Greek philosophy it is an error of the intellect, which explains Plato's notion of sin. In the writings of Homer it is used in referring to marksmanship and without any ethical content. While Paul always uses it in an ethical sense, it can not be taken to describe the goal, nor the course that leads to the goal, but rather the *man* in the race.

Sin is an alienation from God and an isolation from good. It is the fatal bias which "twists the conscience, taints the blood, and causes a malformation of the will." It is self-imposed spiritual death, which includes the hardening of the heart and the deadening of the conscience. It is

possible that in some cases spiritual death may be complete in this life. The sinner reaches a place where divine grace fails to reach him and restoration to repentance becomes impossible. In the fifth chapter of Romans Paul refers to spiritual deafness by the use of the word "parakoe," which means unwillingness to hear the voice of God calling to obedience and perfection. Sin seems to have severed the vital connection which the Father desires to have with His children. In the account of the stoning of Stephen, "who, being filled with the Holy Spirit, was declaring unto them their own wickedness, his persecutors cried out with a loud voice and stopped their ears and rushed upon him with one accord."

"Sin is the transgression of the law." But there are some sins which are not included in this definition. It is sinful for a child not to love a parent, and for a parent not to love a child; but love is not a volition and can not be commanded by the will. "Envy, jealousy, covetousness, suspicion, and distrust, pride, vanity—all these are sin-

ful; they are resisted by the good man because they are sinful; they have no place in a heart perfectly free from sin." Men finally, as Dr. Denney says, come to repent not only of what they have *done,* but repent of what they *are* in their own sinful lives. That expresses concisely the New Testament conception of sin and prepares the way for that true repentance by which individuals are born out of self into God, and out of the lower life of the natural into that more abundant life of the spiritual.

VIII

THE FACT AND ITS ORIGIN

"The account in Genesis is not an allegory nor a myth nor a mere legend or tradition; it is an historical fact revealed by God to the first men and preserved in the primitive style of narration characteristic of the age in which it was written. The Eden story was intended to make known the fact that evil in the world had its origin in disobedience to the Divine command. The account is historical, but, as in other cases, is given in the narrative form. Man fell into sin by yielding to temptation and thus forfeited that which had been originally provided for him, and brought not only upon himself, but upon the posterity the curse of evil in its various forms. He failed under the trial to which his Creator subjected him." —President W. R. Harper.

"Man fell as a moral person responsibly free, and the external form of the temptation, whether this or that, could make no essential difference. . . .

"Let a father once say to a child, in the name of higher concern, 'Thou shalt not!' and there will be the personal battle of Eden all over again. God did not want transgression, but He did want the possibility of it, because He wanted personal sainthood. All evil in possibility is the awful price which had to be paid for any personal sainthood."

—"The Christian Faith," Prof. O. A. Curtis.

THE ORIGIN

Christian doctrine is very intimately associated with the fact of sin. A clear understanding of the Christian conception of moral evil is fundamental to the work of the true theologian. It was the destructive work of humanity that called for the reconstructive work of divinity. Had Adam remained obedient to the divine command—and that we conceive to have been a "possibility"—then there would have been no special necessity for the incarnation, no need for regeneration or justification, and, likewise, no Gethsemane and Calvary. The introduction of sin into the world not only brought ruin to man, but sorrow to God.

The question before us is of supreme importance because of its vital relation to the moral responsibility of man and to the justice of God. The false theories that have been advanced as to the origin of sin have been causal to the greater part of the diffi-

culties which confront the theologian and the philosopher. The theories advanced are many and of varied value. In this discussion we shall refer only to a few of the more important ones.

Among the many speculations as to the origin of sin we find the theory of the Pre-Adamites. The chief exponent of this theory is Professor Winchell, the famous geologist. He does not deny the unity of the race, nor the doctrine of the atonement; he simply denies that Adam was the first man. "Adam descended from a black race, not the black race from Adam." The proof from the Scriptures is of little value, owing to the fact that his references are all to obscure and disputed passages. The marking of Cain, lest any finding him should slay him. He asks, "Who are these enemies?" The "sons of God" (Gen. vi, 1-4) married the "daughters of men." He infers that the "sons of God" were Pre-Adamites, and that the "daughters of men belonged to the Adamites." While these facts may have some plausibility, the whole sweep of Bible

teaching and the fundamental doctrines of our faith unite in holding to the teaching of Genesis that Adam was the first man. The invalidity of the theory destroys its bearing on the doctrine of sin. But if it were assumed to be true, the result would be merely an antedating of the source to a more obscure and almost wholly traditional sphere of thought.

The theory of the pre-existence of souls is of no practical value. It holds that sin is a result of pre-existent sins. Dr. Raymond says, "They would make this world either a prison for the punishment of sin or the hospital for its cure, or perhaps partly both."

Creationism allows the body to descend from human parents, but at each birth God creates a new soul. The race, according to this theory, has a bodily relation, but not a spiritual one. "Depravity is inherent in the material body, and in that way God is connected only with the good; that is, the soul." The origin and transmission of sin are limited to the natural man. This would require us to look upon evil as inherent in matter.

This also destroys the real nature of sin by separating it from all except the physical nature of man. Spirits could not be evil, owing to their lack of physical bodies, and thus death becomes a form of redemption.

The Human Limitation theory claims that man's finiteness is sufficient to explain the origin and universality of sin. Leibnitz, in support of this theory, states that "sin has of necessity arisen from the original imperfection of the creature." This would make God the author of evil, in that he was unable to give man a perfect nature in the beginning. We would be led to conclude that sin is merely the result of a weak and limited human nature, which would free the agent of guilt. Evil would be "good in the making, or holiness in the germ." The remorse of conscience clearly proves that sin ought not to have been committed and, therefore, might have been avoided.

Liberty of choice is not limitation, but the very opposite. Human sovereignty is God's highest gift to man. The author of this theory has confused the terms "origin" and

"possibility." The difference between the two is as great as that between existence and non-existence. The "possibility" naturally resulting from moral freedom is neither sin nor the cause of sin. Finiteness may be the "occasion" of evil, but it is never the primal cause. Between the "ability" to do the wrong and the executive volition which is essential to its actuality, there is the human will, whose decision is final. Man's fall was the result of the misuse of self-intrusted power rather than any divinely imposed limitation.

The real limitation is not in man as a human being, or in God as God, but in God as related to man's sphere of life. Freewill was an essential to the plan and purpose of the Infinite. The fact that it was a moral impossibility for God to create perfect holy beings, does not in any way interfere with His attributes. Character is a result of freedom of choice and can not be imposed by creation. The limitation here referred to is *self-imposed* and in support of the divine plan. We have not in any way interfered with the di-

vine Omnipotence and Omniscience, and at the same time have preserved His justice and goodness by freeing Him from the authorship of evil. He is not the author of evil, but only the "possibility" of evil. Dr. Martensen states in his Christian Dogmatics that "it is only the *possibility* of evil that admits of demonstration. But evil is just that *possibility* which ought to have remained a possibility. Its realization, therefore, can only be conceived as arising from the free will of the creature." If we interpret the word "possibility" in a narrow, physical sense, then it is more possible for me to cast myself from the top of a precipice than it is to ascend, and yet, when we consider man in his totality, we find the destructive "possibility" very powerfully guarded. The acknowledged fact that it is *possible* for every man to commit suicide does not admit of the inference that the "possibility" is going to be universally actualized, nor can we even say that it is in any way causal to suicide. We have found the "possibility" of sin, but the real cause must be sought back of this in the free choice and self-assertive power of the agent.

The Calvinists have not spent much time on the construction of new theories as to how sin came into existence, but have, on the other hand, sought to defend the postulates of their own doctrines. Their work has necessarily been defensive. They have attempted to harmonize the origin of sin with their doctrine of decrees and foreordination. To them it is not a question of experience and consciousness, but a metaphysical speculation in defense of a system. The main issue is regarding the sovereignty of God. They would have a part of the race predestined to final glory, and the rest passed by, or rather, elected to eternal damnation. This would make God absolute and remove all possibility of failure in His plans. The idea of free agency to their method of thought would be a sign of faulty judgment on God's part. Therefore man's future destiny must be decreed from the beginning.

In the solution of the problem of sin and its origin the Word of God is our most authentic source of information. Not reason, but Scripture and reason. Not con-

science, but Christ and conscience. Consciousness must relate itself to revelation. Reason and judgment must revert to the absolute for final decision. Martensen in his Christian Dogmatics states that "in the Mosaic account of the fall of man we meet with a combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative representation of an actual event. The fruit is the glittering world phenomenon, which invites man to enjoy it and to make himself possessor. The serpent, on the other hand, is the worldly principle, which gives the world phenomenon a significance for the human consciousness. Without showing man the fruit, the serpent could never have obtained access to man; for a tempting principle which is notable to point to some corresponding reality, which has splendors to offer, is only a feeble shadow. No sin is committed without the presence of both fruit and serpent, an alluring phenomenon which attracts the sense, and an invisible tempter who holds up before man an illusory image of his freedom." With reverence for the Word and with faith in the divine inspiration

of its authors, let us study the origin of sin. "The doctrine of the origin of sin, says Rishell, "is one of the essential features of Christianity." For convenience we shall consider the fall under four divisions: the person under trial, the place, the law, and the temptation.

First, let us consider the *individual.* The narrative states that "God formed man out of the dust of the ground." He was not let down from heaven, but made to dwell upon the earth and be subject to earth's environment and influences. Physically he was similar to all men—save the fact that he had not been affected by sin or disease. "He was the possessor of a good body, healthy, well-proportioned in all its members. To suppose otherwise would be to impeach its Maker." He was subject to the common fortunes of human existence. He was neither a God nor an angel, but a human being.

Intellectually he had richly and amply endowed faculties, but when asked with what degree of knowledge he was endowed, Foster says, "we are inclined to say, None what-

ever. Knowledge is an acquirement, not a gift." He had the equipment of a man and the favor of the divine agency, but he had no mysterious or unnatural gifts. In speaking of man's original condition, Van Oosterzee says, "It must have been a state of original sinlessness and purity; for God, who by man's conscience forbids him to commit sin, could not by any possibility begin by Himself originating evil." He was innocent, but not perfect. He was here for discipline. He had everything to learn. While he was "subject to mistakes and errors, yet on moral subjects he had an ever-present Guide, whose voice was ever audible." We do not know how long he remained in a state of innocency. Some claim that this extended for some time, at least sufficient time intervened for him to have given names to all the animals and to have gained some knowledge of his surroundings. We may safely assume that, in consequence of his close alliance with God and the absence of any separation due to sin, the communication between heaven and earth was complete.

Secondly, we shall consider *the place of trial.* This was not a veritable paradise, having special sunshine and peculiar enchantment. It was a "place long and abundantly inhabited by living creatures. The whole earth, as much as that particular spot, was to be their home." There is no evidence in Scripture that would lead us to conclude that there were not many other places just as beautiful as this one which God designated as the Garden of Eden. Nature and her products were not essentially different from what we find now. It was a dwelling-place for man, perfect in function, innocent in life, and with an environment conducive to the maintenance of that state. Thus far there has been no sin. Everything was favorable to the free moral agent undergoing the divine test in that primal school of life.

In the third place, *the command* was a simple prohibition instituted by the Divine Creator. The method used was very simple and concrete. There was no possible chance for any confusion or misunderstanding. God's desire was simply to test man's obe-

dience. He arranges everything in Adam's favor. Every provision was conducive to his highest needs and development. He may have lacked the knowledge of sin as the Evil One knew it, but he knew good because he knew God. Whatever he needed was attainable through commendable means. Any experimental knowledge of evil was unnecessary and abnormal to human growth and attainment. The probationer is brought face to face with law. While the law was a necessary element, it was not the real center of the problem. The objective thing used was not causal, but correlative. The apple was "good for food and pleasant to the eyes." The association of this with physical hunger and æsthetic pleasure was not sinful, but natural and innocent. Adam was conscious of the command, and the whole force of his nature said, "Obey God." He was in no sense forced by the pangs of hunger or the bias of evil.

We now come to the consideration of *the tempter*. While we hold that the origin of sin was in the will of man, yet we find that

Satan was a factor in the temptation. The command is presented in a false and deceptive light. They believed God naturally, but Satan seeks to destroy that belief by stating that God is a deceiver and that the eating of the fruit will not cause death; that by deceptive means He is seeking to limit their liberty and subject them to bondage; and furthermore, that the eating of the fruit will open their eyes and they shall become as gods, knowing good and evil. We conclude from these statements that the adversary referred to could not have been a part of their subjective nature, as some have thought. Such subtle suggestions could not originate with innocent persons. The fall can not be attributed to freedom, since freedom in itself is neither sin nor sin-suggestive. We can not attribute it to self-assertion, when that self is the highest expression of God's holiness. Sinful self-assertion can not precede sin, since in this instance the lower self was not yet existent. "The cause of the first sin can not be sin itself." The self-assertion of a depraved man is evil, but the self-asser-

tion of the innocent can not be the genesis of sin.

The will consented to disobedience, but in this case did not assert itself, or the act would have been obedience. Man partakes of the fruit, and the fall is complete. However, the doubt and unbelief induced by Satan ought not to be made causal to the fall. "The fact that the fall of man was occasioned by the temptation of the serpent affords no solution as to the difficulty of the disobedience or the origin of evil, nor is it presented in the Scriptures as doing so. Whatever partial explanation it may be held to give, only removes the mystery a step farther back, since in any case there must have been a first sin to which there was no tempter."

Notwithstanding this fact, man's self-perversion was the act of his own will. There was no possible plea of "not guilty." God's dealing with them is not changed in the least because of the serpent's part in the fall. Temptation is no excuse for sin with free moral agents. Their own action and confession condemns them. "Without sin there is no shame."

The origin of sin, as we have attempted to show, has its rise in the human will. Man's guilt is evidenced by his own freedom and by God's justice and holiness. The fact that sin does not come into the world from some pre-existent state of life, that it is not due to human limitation, that God is not its author, that it is not necessitated; but that it finds its genesis in man's abuse of human freedom—prepares the way for the solution of all correlative problems which confront us in the consideration of the fact of sin.

"Sin is an existing fact," says Dr. A. H. Strong, "but God can not be its author, either by creating man's nature so that sin was a necessary incident of its development or by withdrawing a supernatural grace which was necessary to keep man holy. Reason, therefore, has no other recourse than to accept the Scripture doctrine that sin originated in man's free act of revolt from God—the act of a will which, though inclined toward God, was not yet confirmed in virtue and was still capable of a contrary choice."

IX

THE FACT AND ITS NATURE

"Sin as a state or condition refers, of course, not to actions, but to persons; it is a conception which bids us think not of what a man has done, but of what he is. The sinful action is the symptom or the outcome of a sinfulness which already characterizes the actor; it proceeds from a corruption or depravity of nature which may be far more serious than any given manifestation of it."

—James Denny.

"Human conduct is not a succession of isolated acts: it reveals certain permanent moral qualities which constitute character. There are elements of good and evil in the very life of man. What he says and what he does discloses what he is. He is a bad man—not only because he voluntarily says and does many wicked things, but because he himself is wicked; his very life is very corrupt. He is a good man not only because he voluntarily does many good things, but because he himself is good, his very life is just and pure and kindly. An habitual liar is a liar not only while he is actually telling a lie, but before and afterwards." —R. W. Dale.

THE NATURE

The human will is the lone sentinel of the heart. The sentinel has proven false to his trust, and sin has gained an entrance into the very "holy of holies" of the heart. And in this life-center its seat has been established. We now have the deadly microbes of sin within and the bacilli of evil without. Out of the scarlet-stained heart come the virulent issues of evil.

The "New Theology" of these modern times has brought a new conception of evil. Its fundamental distinction from the "old" is found in its treatment of the nature of sin. The devotees of this new orthodoxy would rob the Church of its power and question the integrity of the Infinite. They would make the existence of evil a present necessity and an inseparable counterpart of good. The idea of lawlessness remains, but the guilt of the transgressor is lessened. Nature and en-

vironment combine to make wrong-doing inevitable. Evil is justified by saying that "man can only reach what he ought to be by passing through what he ought not to be." Man excuses himself and accuses God. But this prevalent notion of outward evil fails to distinctly express its real nature.

The superficial conclusion that growth and development in both the individual and society can only come through a constant struggle against evil antagonisms cheapens human character, disgraces divine wisdom, and makes sin an eternal necessity. This may appear to be an easy solution of the problem of evil, but its whole underlying principle is false to the divine principles of Christ's coming kingdom. We are conscious of the prevalence of this false conception both among philosophers and a certain class of modern theologians, but this fact ought not to excuse its perversions. It is also the popular notion of all devotees of the so-called life of necessitated struggle. We forget that there may be normal antagonisms as well as abnormal, and that there may be healthy

growth due to positive aggressiveness as well as to negative self-defense.

Sin is not an aid, but a hindrance to character culture, except as in certain cases when divine sovereignty overrules it for good. "Evil can not be regarded," says Martensen, "as an immanent feature of the idea of the world; but must, on the contrary, be treated as an *interruption* of the course of its immanent development. Its influence is to hinder and *disturb* all true development. Evil is not involved in the conception of individuality; but is rooted in the perversion of the conception of individuality. Those who entertain the opinion that the good would lack vigor and reality unless accompanied by evil, must have but a faint conception of the inner power of the good and the fullness of positive forces which it contains within itself."

This is a materialistic age, and the tendency is to locate sin in the physical nature. The very nature of the theory denies its validity. The unconscious and impersonal can not determine the nature of sin. A misinter-

pretation of the use of the word "sarx" in the Pauline Epistles accounts for the theory. Orello Cone, of Berlin, in a review of the Pauline doctrine of sin, attempts to prove that sin has its seat in the "flesh" and is "revived" through the agency of the law. The objective sin becomes subjective, the "material" sin becomes "formal." He claims that Paul never used the verb "to sin" (hamartano) except as meaning individual transgression.

He naturally concludes that one at least of the apostle's doctrines of the nature of sin was that it resided primarily in the nature of the individual and "in the first man Adam" as well as his descendants. The first man was of the earth, earthy—that is, the opposite of spiritual—therefore sinful. "Sin inheres in the flesh of the physical or natural man, and it is grounded in his original constitution. Man, being of flesh and "earthy," is naturally mortal, and his mortality is by reason of the divine judgment upon sin.

Thayer says "sarx" has an ethical meaning and denotes the earthy nature of man

apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God; accordingly it includes whatever in the soul is weak, low, debased, tending to ungodliness, and vice. "Flesh signifies the entire nature of man, sense, and reason, without the Holy Spirit." "Evil," says Müller (Vol. I, p. 26), "is the existence of a disturbing, disuniting element in a sphere where the demand for harmony and unity makes itself most singularly emphatic. Were it possible, as Fichte and Novalis declare, to shake off 'the old grievous delusion of sin,' as an empty dream, by a resolute determination, who would not in so convenient a manner be released! But as the well-known cunning of the ostrich does not save it from the shot of the huntsman, neither will the shutting of our eyes to the existence of evil cause it to vanish, but only the more certainly deliver us into its power." With the sincere seeker after truth, to know sin is the antecedent step toward remedy, and to know righteousness is to possess it.

Sin is not a disease of the body, although it is closely associated with many phases of

physical evil and human misery. It is not a species of bacilli in the blood. If that were true we had better turn our churches into hospitals and have our preachers become physicians. Evil is related to health and bodily life, but the relation is causal rather than qualitative. Sin leads to physical disease and death as well as spiritual, but the agent is not to be found in that which it acts upon. Sin is a spiritual disease and requires a spiritual remedy. To locate evil in matter would require a physical atonement and render the sufferings of the God-man a mere absurdity. "Evil is not only at variance with the good," says one, "but also with itself; if the good has only one enemy, the evil has two, *the good and the evil.*"

The Greek philosophers located evil in the intellectual nature of man. Error was the sole source of sin, and men do wrong because they are ignorant of the truth. Educate the people and evil will disappear, is their dictum, but knowledge is a poor index to character. In Christ's estimate of character, the culture of the Pharisee was as

valueless as the rags of the Publican. We would not undervalue education, it is a universal necessity, but we would search deeper and find sin in the heart life. Character and culture can produce those who account themselves debtors to all men, but culture alone can only develop irresponsible, self-centered individualists.

A third man locates sin in our environment. His panacea for evil would be to change the sinner's location, improve his surroundings, build him a better home, and furnish him with better clothing and properly prepared food. Grant that all these are desirable and necessary, and we still have failed to change the man. The philanthropist who would do constructive work must come to the realization that it is the sinful man who makes the bad environment, and not the bad environment that always makes the sinner. The successful remedy must be internal rather than external. Selfishness is the primal seat of sin. As Müller has said (Vol. I, p. 135), "if a man loves things instead of God, he only loves himself in them,

only seeks in them his own gratification." The radical tendency of sinful inclinations and lust for impersonal existence does not hold good if our object be to discover the real nature of sin. Pride is the most naked form of selfishness, and though its initial step is hatred, it may be found in virtue as well as vice." Dr. Denney, in a reference as to the nature of sin, says "that when a man sins he does something in which his whole being participates, and the conscious reaction is that of the whole system of things in arms against him." The murders, thefts, the brutalities, the wrecked homes and ruined lives: these are only the incidental expressions of sin. If the fruit is bad, the tree is still worse. The outward act may be a crime against society, but the sin-state of the actor's heart is a crime against God. We are told that the wages of sin is death, but the greater part of the wages is not received here. The deepest meaning of sin comes to us in that unknown word "death."

From a study of Demonology we are enabled to more fully understand the nature

of sin. Satan, as we may infer from Scripture, is a fallen angel. The very nature of the environment of angels makes sin with them a much greater crime than among earthly creatures. The higher the being, the greater the curse of evil. Probation for angels and for the redeemed is an irrational invention of man. If a human being sin while in this life, it is right that he should have a probation and an opportunity to repent; but if an angel rebel against God, let it be a sin unto death which merits eternal judgment.

"Since Satan is a purely spiritual being, sin can not have its seat in the sensuous nature or in the mere possession of a physical nature." Those who hold that sin has its seat in the physical and intellectual nature of man must deny that it is possible for Satan to be sinful. We would then be forced to conclude that in the future life, having lost our physical nature, the good and bad will alike be sinless. Sin reaches far deeper than the "sarx"—even to the soul of man.

Shall we consider Satan a weak, poorly endowed creature? Not if we gain our in-

formation from the Scriptures. Paul was not given to exaggeration in portraying his enemies. But he thought it essential for the Christian warrior to have on the *whole* armor of God, if he would be successful in contending against the wiles of the devil. Not a battle against flesh and blood, but against powers and spirits of wickedness in heavenly places. Our enemy is possessed of wily wisdom and demoniac power. Evil finds its abode not in the infirmity of the flesh or the intellect, but in the citadel of the heart. It is this that gives it its reigning principle and enslaving power. Christ came to destroy the works of Satan—these are spiritual. Our vision of sin may be gained from the manifold manifestations in the sensuous nature, but its seat is in the very center of the spirit life.

We fail to understand evil because our sight is confined to the outward appearances, but "God looketh on the heart." Dr. Martensen remarks that, "if evil be taken as impersonal, its sting is taken away and it sinks into a mere power of nature, still it can not

be personal in exactly the same sense as God is personal. It is man, therefore, who gives the devil being; but it by no means follows from this that man is only his own devil. It is another, a superhuman principle, to which existence is imparted by man, a tempting, seducing, making-possessed, and inspiring power, to which man lends himself as to a *non ego*. The devil is a spirit that man has voluntarily conjured to himself, and is not able to cast out. He requires the help of Him who is the Master and God of the spirit-world. No personal reality is attributed to the devil beyond or apart from the world of man. A negative principle has no personality in itself, but can only obtain personality in living creatures.'' We have here the presentation of a great theologian's interpretation of the Biblical doctrine of Satan, and an attempted explanation of his personality, which in no way denies the reality of the fact, but seeks to satisfy the philosophic spirit of the student by a new view of personality.

X

THE FACT AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

"Sin first of all reveals itself in its real character, when the requirement of holiness in the conscience reveals itself to man as a requirement of loving resignation to God, and is rejected by him with aversion. Here sin first of all becomes directly seen what it really is, namely, a turning away from God; and as an augmented degree of personal guilt is attached to this turning point, there is also connected with the same a benumbing of the heart, in which those higher emotions and impulses perish."

—"Christian Doctrine of Sin," Julius Müller.

"What is sin? It is the conscious choice of evil instead of good; it is the refusal on the part of a moral agent to choose what he believes to be right. There was never a better definition of sin than that of the Apostle James: 'Therefore to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin.' Nothing is sin which is not the result of the conscious choice on the part of one who is free to choose differently. That is not sin which necessarily follows ignorance or compulsion. Sin is willful transgression of the law; or as it is expressed in the Revised Version, it is lawlessness; that is, the living in a world of law and order as if there were neither."

—"The Age of Faith," Amory H. Bradford.

THE CHARACTERISTICS

Sin in its amenability to the absolute must include certain essential characteristics or attributes. The analysis here given is based on the Christian conception of sin in its relations to divine government.

The first of these elements is Personality. Life may be destroyed and suffering may result from purely physical or natural laws. Physical evil may come through impersonal action. But moral evil presupposes personality. It is the unique product of man. "Sin," says Foster, "is something which the individual man does: it is *an act*. There is no sin where there is not a sinner; and there is no sinner where there is not an act committed by him which constitutes him a sinner." The agent must first be a person before he can be guilty of any transgression of the moral law. Instinct and spontaneous impulse are the non-moral features of "neces-

sity." "It is the man himself, the person, the self, the 'ego'—the man, whatever you please to term him—that we hold responsible, and praise or blame."

The true person has self-consciousness. He can objectify self, weigh acts, consider motives, estimate responsibility, and practice freedom in moral action. The animal may have a sense of fear, but no idea of guilt. The dog may know his master, but he can not know self. He is never conscious of moral duty and, therefore, never sins. The highest animals all lack that mysterious power that makes man a personality. As Browning wisely states it, "The beasts *are,* they can never be more," but "man partly is and wholly hopes to be." He is a conscious personality and has power to know himself and his sin and to advance beyond what he has been or knows himself now to be.

The second element in moral accountability is Rationality. The person must be capable of intelligent choice before he can be held amenable to the moral law. Infants and idiots are excluded from the realm of

rational choice. There must be a possibility of reflection and judgment, or "suspension of choice" becomes an absurdity. "Animals have motive impulses and volitional power; but they can not choose the ends of their volitions, because lacking the faculties of rational apprehension."

The self-consciousness of every man intuitively affirms rationality to be a necessary element in responsible action. When man loses his reason he becomes less than a person. Dr. Hodge claims that "any volition which does not follow the best dictates of the understanding, in this sense of the word is an act of an idiot. It may be spontaneous just as acts of brutes are, but it can not be free in the sense of being the act of an accountable person." But is not all sin irrational from the Christian point of view? A man may do foolish things and yet not be a fool. The fact that he does the wrong when he might have done the right, does not necessarily predicate irrationality, but only evidences his freedom and power of self-assertion.

Human sovereignty is a part of personality. The free agent is not limited to the choice of the good. He may fully realize that the course he is about to pursue is not the most rational, nor likely to result in highest good; but he wills it regardless of these considerations. It is in the *willful irrationality* of the act that sin gains its exceeding sinfulness. Back of all motives, all standards of ethics, and all arguments for rationality in action—man's will controls volition. I do not know that we shall ever improve Müller's definition of sin as being "a conscious turning away from the love of God to self-seeking." Augustine held the essence of sin to be pride, while Calvin regarded it as unbelief. In all these instances, however, there is the element of freedom.

The question of the freedom of the will is central and fundamental to the correct interpretation of Christian doctrine. To deny freedom and assume necessity is fatal to God's total dealing with man, and defeats His purpose and plan in respect to the creation of the race. The power of "contrary

choice'' is absolutely indispensable to any system of moral government. All who admit that we are responsible moral beings are compelled to grant the inseparable element of free choice.

The whole discussion takes the form of an explanation. Man has an active as well as a passive existence. Consciousness testifies to our ability to choose. Calvinists would deny the testimony of consciousness by referring it to a non-existent choice which has not yet taken place, rather than properly applying it to the existing ''power'' which is able to make the contrary choice possible.

God willed man to be free, but not to sin. It was humanity's only road to moral excellence. The whole question of human character which lifts man above the animal world is dependent on human sovereignty. Man must be free or cease to be moral. Sin must be a ''possibility'' or freedom is an unreality. In the physical realm we are content to be acted upon, but in the moral sphere we hold that our will is supreme. Tennyson says, ''Our wills are ours, to make them Thine.''

That is correct when speaking under moral restraint and is in perfect harmony with Christian duty. But whether our wills are ours or not in the proper sense of ownership, we are not *compelled* to make them His. When we surrender them to God and say, "No longer my will be done, but Thine," it is by the voluntary consent of our will, and not by any inward or outward necessity.

We may view the problem through a study of our own consciousness and experience, in so far as they find support in divine revelation. If we deny a man this testimony we immediately impeach the very faculties by which he seeks to express himself. We all recognize that we are the possessors of two natures—more or less in opposition to each other. Paul designates the one as "spiritual" and the other as "carnal." We may call them the inherent good and evil. Are we under bondage to either of these? Which is master—the will or these inner tendencies? That we follow the divine element in us seems at first to be necessary to perfection in Christ and also to insure the success

of the divine plan. That we follow the evil in us is necessary to explain man in his present condition of sin and vice. But if we admit the sinlessness and purity of our first parents, then we are compelled to say that Adam was an exception. Matter can not be evil and primitive man sinless: having granted these two facts, man's will *must* be free to explain the present existence of sin. Those who claim that man is really free only in the realm of the good, are at a loss to explain change in character.

A log in the river is free *to* float down stream, but not free *from* floating down; nor is it free to go up stream. Men are not logs thrown into different streams—some good and some evil. Freedom to float with the current—whether that be good or bad—when at the same time we have no alternate choice, is not freedom. It is the will that determines character, not character that determines the will. Virtue and vice influence, but do not control, action. Sin may be defined here as the self-asserted action of the human will in opposition to divine authority.

"We regard the will as the seat of virtue and vice. The morality in the will begins at the place where conscience interposes. . . . In short, human virtue consists in the will." The use of the word "seat" in this passage is rather at fault. The will is the determining power which controls action, that shapes the issues of life which flow from the heart, that decides what shall find entrance to the heart; but the real seat of virtue and sin is back of the will. Christ always sought entrance through the will, but the work He wrought was analogous to David's need, expressed in his prayer for the creation of a new heart and the renewing of a right spirit within. If "human virtue and vice consist in the will," then action is necessitated. We must place the will above and in control of these virtues and vices, if we are to explain man's action.

The Calvinists, with whom we have chiefly to deal in this question of freedom, have attempted to harmonize their doctrine of decrees and foreordination with the idea of free volition. They say man is outwardly

free, but yet hold to inner necessity. This divine inner necessity controls outward actions, and as a result outward freedom can exist only in theory. They would oppose common judgment and consciousness, and excuse themselves by a reference to the law of causality. However, the main difficulty is in the interpretation of terms used. Absolute freedom is quite a different thing from relative freedom. We believe that the righteous man is under a different motive power from the unrighteous person, and that he is more apt to do good than evil. One man has a momentum toward the good and another a bias toward evil, but *both are free.*

Findlay, in discussing the Holy Spirit, quotes from Paul, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." He refers to the "spirit of liberty" and the "spirit of bondage." The coexistence of divine sovereignty and human liberty is spoken of as a paradox. Our independence is relative and environed by the divine will. "We are bound by our own past and the past of our race. We are shut in and held down by habit and circum-

stance, so that our choice is limited practically to a choice of moral evil." The Holy Spirit comes in and sets us free. Liberty is of the sons of God; that is, those who are living in harmony with God's will. This would be true if motives controlled volition.

The Apostle Paul did not mean to infer necessitated action to all who were not in harmony with the divine will. This bondage to the flesh affected the motive range and rendered good action more difficult, but pure freedom of volition is not annulled by sin. The captain of a vessel is just as free to turn his vessel up stream as down, so far as he is concerned. It causes more effort on the part of the men below. The adverse wind and strong tide may defeat the carrying out of his volition. The paths of good and evil are both open to man; but while the way of the transgressor is hard, the path of the just is as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

Man is free to choose in that no foreign will can irresistibly cause him to will against his own will. He is not free in so far as the

sin which has been allowed by himself crowds out the good and inclines him toward the bad. Freedom of the will is not dependent on physical ability in the moral realm. If sin is complete in the volition without the outward act, then virtue is complete, even though a man fail in putting his desire into action. The habitual drunkard may reach a state of bondage in which his appetite controls his action. He wills to stop drinking. His volition represents him totally, but he has lost the ability necessary to put this choice into action. Two men who are equally able to swim are on a sinking boat. Both desire to be saved, and both will to reach the shore. The one is successful in the execution of his volition. The other fastens his bags of gold about him and he fails. Can we say that either was in bondage so far as the will was concerned? The failure was due to self-imposed limitation upon physical strength.

The total teaching of Scripture shows that God always deals with men as free moral agents. He places before them life and happiness, and they choose misery and

death. He offers them the good, and they rebel against Him and seek the evil. In the New Testament the law is the same, except that the coming of Christ widened the field of good motives and increased their value; yet the balance still stands before each man and he has power to turn it either way. The weight of his personality outweighs the overbalance on either side.

Man was originally free in that he did not have a depraved nature, but the tendency toward sin is counterbalanced by the "immediate" benefits of the atonement. When a man comes to the age of accountability with an added bias in favor of evil, Christ meets him with an equal power for good which places him before the law practically as though he was free from the sin-tendency.

Christ spoke to men with a clear understanding of their freedom. Non-acceptance of his salvation was always attributed to the unwillingness of the subject, and never to inability or necessity. "Willest thou to be made whole"—always preceded the work of the Divine Physician. He who was the incar-

nation of Omnipotence and Omniscience stands without, asking entrance of the human will. He knocks at the door. He seeks to enter; but the agent decides the opening of the door. The latch is on the inside. But some one says that would defeat the plan of redemption. Not at all. Because I am free does not in the least prevent me from choosing the good and rejecting the bad.

God in His wisdom has so constituted humanity that every ruined life is a danger signal warning men to depart from the evil way, while every good life is a guiding light to keep them in the right path. The "new race" developed under freedom is going to include more than half of humanity. Finite reason may at times be troubled about the plans of the Infinite and be tempted to think it better to have had the human will wholly under control of the divine will; but our keen sense of responsibility is certain to testify that such judgment is erroneous.

The denial of human freedom makes salvation an arbitrary act of God, demands a limited atonement, makes void human respon-

sibility for sin, annuls character which has its source in freedom, and drives men to the logical conclusion which would end in universalism. Man differs from the corrupt tree in that he has the power to will a change in his character through divine aid, and thus cause it to produce good fruit instead of evil. He is not a creature of *presented* motives, but the result of *chosen* motives. Man's will is the determining power in final choice. We may present our arguments, our moral impetus, our prayers and pleadings, and the Holy Spirit's power may also be applied to man's rebellious nature; but all this can not necessitate choice. Divinely granted human sovereignty is capable of standing out in opposition to all these. Man is free, and therefore responsible. He is responsible, and therefore amenable to the moral law and guilty of sin committed. The vitality of Christianity can be maintained only through freedom of the will. And this freedom of the will is necessary to any rational solution of the problem of evil.

A knowledge of the law is another ele-

ment in our analysis of the responsible agent. In the courts of the State a knowledge of the law is taken for granted as an essential qualification of citizenship, and ignorance of the law is no excuse for disobedience. The moral government of God differs from this, in that the basis of estimating guilt is dependent on the transgressor's knowledge of the law or his ability and opportunity to have known it. There 's a wideness in God's mercy and a justice in His judgment which is foreign to man. We must know His will before we can live it. However, we find that the law is not only made known to man in revelation, but there is an inner law written on the heart. Paul speaks of the "Gentiles who have not the law outwardly written, but who show a work of the law written in their hearts and consciences." Sin is not imputed (reckoned) where there is no knowledge of law. "The person can not sin if the law which he transgresses be unknown to him in such a degree that he is unconscious of wrong in the act committed, or in the determination of himself thereto."

As Shakespeare says, "The wish is father to the thought." Sin is knowledge opposed, not ignorance followed. Unknown law is akin to absence of law. The last command of our Lord was, "Go ye into all the world and teach all nations." Give them the law, and then command them to observe it. Possibly knowledge in morals becomes a measure of man's accountability to God. We are not to condemn men who know not the law, but to "him who knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to *him it is sin.*"

The last characteristic of sin is that it is a voluntary transgression of some moral law. The moral element in the act is complete as soon as the volition is made. The external action is only an expression of the internal state of the heart. The intent and motive of the free moral agent must be taken into consideration as giving quality to the action. The act may be natural, and yet immoral, but if it be necessitated it becomes unmoral. Sin must arise from intentional personal volition, and the act must be committed within the sphere of moral law. "Sin is

not an entity or substance of any kind, material or immaterial, which is conveyed from one being to another, by generation or in any other way." We must therefore distinguish it from substance, effect or potency, produced by natural forces or transmitted by physical generation.

In our analysis of the attributes of sin we have the following fundamental elements as peculiar to the person whom Christianity would justly designate as a sinner.

Sin can be predicated only of personal beings.

The person must be rational.

The rational person must also have the power of "contrary choice," or freedom of the will.

There must also be a known law which the sinner is conscious of having transgressed.

The act must be intentional and voluntary.

XI

THE FACT AND ITS TRANSMISSION

"With evil once begun, the race is a succession of tainted individuals,—an organism that works toward continuance of evil. Not but good is transmitted at the same time, for it goes along with the evil. Any virtue or value that is strong enough to live will pass from generation to generation, even while evil is making the same journey; and thus have been perpetuated those fundamental qualities that make society possible and life worth living from day to day in spite of all the evil."

—"An Outline of Christian Theology," W. N. Clarke.

"Under the law of heredity the definite moral evils which are constitutionally present in parents are transmitted—we can not tell how—to children and to children's children. I am not sure that the word transmitted accurately represents the facts; it may, I can not tell. We are perhaps on surer grounds when we say that the definitely moral evils which are constitutionally present in the parents, reappear in the children. Families have their characteristic vices and their characteristic virtues. Sometimes a generation escapes the taint, and it reappears in the next." —R. W. Dale.

THE TRANSMISSION

The question of the transmission of sin presents a vast field for investigation and room for all manner of speculation. The laws of heredity as well as those which have to do with the spread of crime and the development of virtue are before the student of this problem. We may study the individual as well as society, and discover transmitted influence in almost every sphere of human life. But as introductory to this discussion we must state that transmitted depravity is not transmitted *sin,* nor does hereditary tendency carry with it hereditary *guilt.*

The realistic theory of Adamic sin has its main defense in the theology of Dr. Shedd. He treats individuals not as separate personalities in themselves, but as modes and manifestations of the generic nature. While our presence in Adam was impersonal, it was real and substantial. "Adam was the ge-

neric man, and owing to the fact that the essential being of the whole race was in him, all men had a common participation in the primitive sin." This reduces individuals to mere modes of one substance. The race is held responsible because this generic nature was rational and in Adam. Adam sinned, and therefore all men sinned, because they were mysteriously present in him. We reply to this—that sin is personal, and in no sense can it be generic.

The representative theory makes Adam the head of the race in a very unique sense. His sin was not the act of an individual, but an act which represented *all* men. This federal headship constituted a moral and legal oneness of the race, so that *his* fall meant the fall of the *entire* race. But Adam could not represent us in his personal act, for the reason that we were in no moral sense represented. We might designate such an act as "implication without representation."

Setting aside the foregoing theories and also the unjust notion of divine imputation, we find in the law of genetic transmission

a clear account of the depravity of man. This is a uniform law of nature and is in perfect accord with Scripture teaching. Every species of organic life reproduces its own kind. The Old Testament holds to "like producing like." "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Men are conceived in sin and born depraved. While all sin is personal, depravity is inherited. Adam was not the "federal," but the parental head of the race of which we all are members. His position in respect to the race was very similar to that of a father in relation to his family. In the physical life of man, the strong constitution of the parent is readily detected in the development of the child.

We find in the intellectual life that the change is very slight. The highly educated man does not transmit his wisdom to his children, but there does come a latent capacity which is capable of being developed, and which gives the son of the educated man an advantage over the son of his uneducated brother. The capacity is inherited, but not

the knowledge. The moral nature furnishes a peculiar expression of this law. We inherit the good results of acquired virtues and the bad effects of evil habits. This never remains exactly the same in any two generations, being partly under our control. It may miss one generation and reappear in the next. The Lord referred to this when He said, "I will visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations." This is not *sin,* but a *capacity* for sin.

But the universal depravity which comes from Adam is mysteriously unlike the preceding inheritance. It is unvarying in its amount. This is an evidence of God's justice. The sons of Adam had to bear no more nor less than the average son born to-day. Were this not the fact, in course of time a long lineage of saints might grow into perfection through the genetic law of transmission. The tendency to sin varies greatly in different persons, but this may be accounted for by the varying heritage of good and evil. Unlike the acquired tendencies, it never

misses a generation. By this theory we would not interfere with the beneficial results of righteous living, nor the enslaving effect of a life spent in sin. The one enlarges the range of the motive-state of the good and renders it easier for a man to do right, while the other enlarges the sphere of the bad motives and makes it more difficult to choose the good.

The children of sanctified persons inherit depravity, and they themselves have to battle with temptation. But as in the case of the child, this depravity is not sin and in no way interferes with the believer's acceptance. Depravity will continue to exist, whether men profess sanctification or remain in sin. The genetic law of transmission will never cease to render man depraved until the race connection be completely severed; and the atonement, which was for *all* men, will never become of none effect. "The whole race," says R. W. Dale, "shares in sin, and yet they have the opportunity of sharing in its redemption.

"Christ is the propitiation for the sin of

the world. There is an evil power in the life of the race—a great and awful power—which, if unresisted, will destroy us; but the grace of God in Christ is infinitely mightier to redeem and to save. We are born to that redemption, to that salvation; it lies with each one of us to determine whether we will receive or reject it. If we are finally lost it will not be because we belong to a sinful race, but because we have rejected the infinite mercy of God which has achieved the redemption of the race in Christ."

The extent of the transmission of sin, as we shall attempt to show, is universal. In apostolic days Paul and Silas were accused by the unbelieving Jews of "turning the world upside down." But "upside down," in the language and thought of the world, is "right side up" to the Christian. The twelve different words used in Scripture to denominate sin lead us to believe that for some reason there is failure on man's part in attempting to reach some goal or designated mark. The genetic law of transmission, when we consider it in connection with our idea of the

solidarity of the race, renders it impossible for any member of the race to escape the natural inheritance of a depraved nature. While this is not sin in itself, yet it almost universally becomes actualized in human experience.

The denial of the race connection and the hereditary transmission of the Adamic nature would interfere seriously with the proof of the universality of sin. Some claim that all men sin, as a natural result of their finiteness, and that, if any other member of the race had been in Adam's place, the result would have been the same. The foregoing statement is a mere assumption and without any valid proof. The most that we could say would be that a part might have acted similarly, but not all. The moment we say all are certain to do acts of disobedience we must admit some universal cause for their action, and thus we would set a seal upon the law of sin in humanity.

The *fact of freedom* is held by others to be a sufficient proof of the universality of sin. We admit that it may account for many

cases, but not for all. Universal results require universal causes. This is illustrated by the common experience of every-day life. Suppose that on a certain street we notice all the people rushing one way, we immediately seek some cause for this action. But if the crowd had been about equally divided and traveling in different directions, we would have given it no special attention. Every phenomenon of nature that acts without uniformity must be governed by some law. The universal cause which is to account for the sinful tendency of all human beings can find a logical source only in the fall of man.

If we interpret the passage "in Adam all die" as including physical death, then we have a second universal cause in support of that of inherited depravity. That all men experience physical death is undeniable. If this result of the fall is without exception, then we naturally infer that the others mentioned in connection with this follow the same law. But as this interpretation is open to dispute, it is not a valid proof in our argument.

We find evidence in the fact that there is a universal consciousness of failure among all classes of men. In proof of this we may follow the argument of Dr. Curtis and refer to the best men, and find that the most saintly are quite free to admit imperfections and failures. Evil may have its degrees, but sin is universal. "Every one who examines attentively the dictates of conscience and the principle to which these may be reduced, and who in any way realizes what man's character ought to be, must feel that the doctrine of the universality of sin among men is vitally true. We also realize that despite the varied explanations and assumptions the fact is inexplicable that, in so far as we know, every member of the human race has come short of the moral standard which conscience compels us to acknowledge as the rule of ethical judgment."

We turn to the Scriptures, and while there is no theory set forth, yet everywhere there is expressed the fact of universal sin. Whether it be in the Old or the New Testament, the same great truth is present which

in time finds expression in a universal atonement for sin. "All we, like sheep, have gone astray." "There is none that doeth good; no, not one." "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none righteous, no, not one." Aside from the abundant proof of the universality of sin found in the Scripture, we have the evidence suggested by the following statements:

The universal testimony of consciousness as to moral failure.

The fall of man as seen in its relation to the solidarity of the race.

The law of genetic transmission, which at present is so universally accepted.

The fact that no exception has yet been found.

Depravity is universal as to the race, but it is not total as to the individual. In the discussion of this question some still hold that man is totally depraved and incapacitated for any good act. That the fall has so affected man that he is unable to save him-

self, is a well-authenticated fact. But we may still affirm that it is possible for man to live free from the vicious and criminal acts of more degraded classes. However, it is fair to state that very much of the good we observe in non-Christian men is a result of the immediate and unconditional benefits of Christ's atonement, which come freely to every member of the race. "Man is, therefore, by grace, but not by his fallen nature, as one theologian expresses it, a moral being, capable of knowing, loving, obeying, and enjoying God; but when the hour comes that his destiny is fixed, when he has been abandoned of God, when the spirit has taken its final departure, then, and not till then, is man in a condition that can properly be called a condition of total depravity."

While all men are sinners, all are not alike in the nature and degree of their sin. We would not dare say that men are totally depraved and abandoned of God. The Westminster Confession claims that "we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil."

The Free Church of Scotland, in 1892, qualified its adhesion to the above confession by saying "that in holding and teaching, according to the Confession of Faith, the corruption of man's whole nature as fallen, the Church also maintains that there remain tokens of his greatness as created in the image of God and of duty; that he is responsible for compliance with the moral law and the gospel, and that, although unable without the aid of the Holy Spirit to return to God, he is yet capable of affections and actions which in themselves are virtuous and praiseworthy." In the Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church we find this statement: "Man is far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually." This is undogmatic and liberal, and leaves a wide latitude for varied thought and theories.

In the fall Adam not only brought ruin to his moral nature, but to his physical and intellectual faculties as well. Aside from the question of physical death, he was depraved and under condemnation of God and the

moral law. He is saved from physical death and permitted to become the father of the race. "He is now Adam the fallen; a sinner —out of favor—under sentence—guilty—driven from Eden—his heritage and heart clouded with sin and crime—self-centered and under the frown of his Maker, exposed to endless wrath; yet he was Adam reprieved: provisionally redeemed; offered pardon; placed under circumstances of mercy; encouraged and helped to regain his lost position of favor." The Pelagians dissent from this view and claim that Adam was affected only in his personal relations to law.

They would have us to believe that Adam was not interfered with subjectively and that man is not diseased, but rather in a state of health, needing diet. Also that in course of time man may rid himself of the present effects of sin. This might be explained as a kind of salvation by good breeding. We do not claim that there are no high and noble qualities in humanity, but we do find a sinful tendency in every man, which no long line

of saints can eradicate from his nature. No internal diet nor external environment can ever achieve complete restoration to righteousness. The difficulty lies too deep for any remedy save that which we have in the potency of Christ's atoning sacrifice.

In a study of this question Dr. Denney claims that "there are two interests which Christian theology must keep in view. First, the effect of sin on human nature, and especially on the human will, must be such that man needs a redeemer; and, secondly, it must only be such that he remains susceptible of redemption. It is only when we fully recognize what men have done, that we can insist on what they are unable to do. And the doctrine of spiritual inability, as consequent on the corruption of man's nature by sin, remains and will always remain to represent the great truth that there is *one* thing which man can not do *alone*. He can not bring his state into harmony with his nature. He can not fulfill the destiny for which he was created. He can not enter into peace with God as if his sin and its consequences were noth-

ing; he can not annul the past; he can not overcome it; he can not, in spite of it, enjoy the glorious liberty of the children of God. When a man has been discovered who has been able, *without* Christ, to reconcile himself to God and to obtain dominion over the world and sin, *then* the doctrine of inability or of the bondage due to sin may be denied; *then,* but *not till then.*"

XII

THE FACT AND ITS RELATIONS

"Christ came to give an actual present salvation; to deliver us from the hell of sin within us and to fill us with the heaven of holiness. Sin is the source and substance, the fire and the worm of hell, and from it Christ would save us now."—Professor R. Flint.

"The remedy must be as deep as the disease. Inasmuch as sin is more than moral corruption, its cure must be more than ethical reformation. Since sin consists essentially in apostasy from God, redemption must be nothing less than a reconciliation issuing in a restoration of communion with God."—W. F. Adeney.

THE RELATIONS

God is infinite and absolute as Deity, but even Deity may impose upon itself limitation when acting in relation to other spheres of life. It does not take from the omnipotence and omniscience of God to claim that, while He could create perfectly innocent beings, yet He could not create men who were holy and tested in character, except by making them free moral agents and placing them in a world where sin, although not an actuality, was at least a possibility. If we say that divine omnipotence has no limitations, then the natural result is universalism. The reason for this limitation is found in the motive which led to man's creation. True love and obedience, as well as proper objects for the bestowment of love, can only be where free choice determines character.

The creation of a world could not add to the sovereignty of God; and as to divine love,

there was a place for that in the Trinity. The supreme object of the Creator was the development of a race under freedom. Sin entered and a new race center had to be provided. Sin interfered with the solidarity of the race. It had no place in the divine plan, and if men had not sinned the first race would have been complete. Sin brought a Savior. All men were conditionally redeemed. Some will persist in rejecting the divine offer, and they shall finally be severed from the race proper. This separation is what constitutes the death of the wicked. God has so freely provided for man's redemption that self-assertion and willful continuation in sin is the only power that can separate us from the love of Christ and exclude us from the new race of holy men.

The Lord speaks of sin in no uncertain way. Many superficially teach that God's attitude toward sin is merely one of arbitrary choice and capable of being altered at any time. "They fail to realize," says Dr. Curtis, "that God could not be God, that He could not exist at all, without hating sin.

But we must not go to the other extreme of holding that this divine hatred is but an intense smiting by an impersonal law, and that there is no personality involved. This divine hatred of sin is grounded in God's holiness and finds expression not only in depravity and the broken brotherhood, but also in the natural world." From Genesis to Revelation we see God's abhorrence and loathing of sin. It is only evil, and that continually. He can not look upon it with the least degree of satisfaction. Every creature that has been touched and tainted by evil bears an impress of its abnormal character. The blight and ruin we behold on every hand witness to God's disapproval. Every voice of revelation and every act of providence are against the wrong and in favor of the right. It has no place in the divine plan, no excuse for its existence anywhere or at any time. "God hath no pleasure in wickedness, neither shall evil dwell with Him."

"Guilt" may be defined as self-condemnation resulting from some conscious act of disobedience. Its nature is personal, and there-

fore can not be imputed. We do not gain it through creation or by inheritance. Guilt always points toward the future. Man may be guilty for the sins of his offspring, but never for those of his ancestors. The question of authorship is the universal basis in the idea of guilt. We must not only be conscious that sin is in the world and in us, but that we are causal to it. The individual conscience addresses the personality and exclaims, "Thou art the man!" It is only when we treat sin theoretically and philosophically that we can even temporally refer it to God or some combination of external forces. The very moment we come to think on the evil in our own lives we find how absolutely impossible it is to escape personal responsibility and, hence, guilt for sin. And, after all, the solution of the difficult universal problem is in the solution of the easy personal problem. Our difficulties are largely due to our taking hold of the large end of the problem, rather than the small end. Thus world problems are reduced to the simplicity of knowing self.

The feeling of responsibility which comes through our consciousness of freedom is the basis of guilt. Because of this fact we feel the force of *ought* in relation to our moral ideal, and conscience warns us against transgressing this inner law of duty. Ability to do the right is causal to guilt. We rebel against God, and there follows a sense of deserved penalty. We lose our peace of conscience. It was this that prompted our first parents to seek a hiding-place from God. It was this that caused Judas to return the thirty pieces of silver and drove him to suicide. It is this that causes the criminal to confess his crime and submit to punishment. It is this that moves the multitudes to repentance and reformation.

Sin determines guilt, and guilt measures sin. "There can never be sinless guilt or guiltless sin." These two terms are thus inseparably connected. However, we may distinguish between them by saying that "the act is harmful, but the actor is guilty." The fact that the moral law prohibits the act renders the transgressor liable to penalty. A

man may be guilty before his own standard of morality, apart from Christianity. He has a sense of violation of an ideal which is certain to bring remorse. It renders him dissatisfied with self for the time being, until by some means he is able to rid himself of this feeling. But this is a lower form of guilt and not equal to that which comes to a man who realizes that he has committed a crime, not only against his fellow-man, but against the very holiness of a loving Heavenly Father. There comes a feeling that the favor of God has been forfeited, a deep-seated guilt which cries out, "I have sinned against heaven and in Thy sight."

Plutarch gives us a vivid picture of the awful reality of guilt in a scene at a public altar, where "men with tear-stained eyes and pallid and woe-begone countenances are literally rolling in the mire, seeking to have lifted a burden that was too real to be shaken off or laughed away." This seems dark and hard, but it is the way that leads to light and peace.

The measure of our realization of the

holiness of God not only adds to our conception of sin, but also of our consciousness of guilt. Guilt may become so real as to prevent a willing prayer and, in its frenzy, welcome stern justice as an effective means of restoration. The very remorse of conscience which follows transgression evidences to God's displeasure with sin. We may truly say that right must be right, since wrong brings guilt. It is not conscience, but sin-caused guilt, that makes cowards of us all. Apart from guilt conscience produces uncompromising heroes and martyrs.

The measure of guilt is determined by three things: the character of the motive which prompted the act; the conception of divine holiness, and the character of the sin itself. Luther often cried out, "O, my sins, my sins!" and yet it is said he was unable to name any particular sins, showing very clearly that his guilt was based on a sin-state of the whole life rather than being due to any special acts of evil.

"There are times," says R. W. Dale, "when, in addition to the burden of my per-

sonal transgressions, I seem to share the responsibility of that 'fall of man' which has 'brought death unto the world and all our woe.' There are times when I can not think of the sins, even the grossest sins, of other men, as though I were wholly free from the guilt of them, for we share a common life, and there is a solidarity of the race in sin.'' Here we have the solidarity of the race as causal to guilt, and, on the other hand, the sense of guilt for others' sins gives evidence of the fact that we share in some mysterious manner a common and unified life.

Sin is not always an essential to suffering. We might have a sinless world and still have physical suffering. Physical evil must be distinguished from personal sin. A child may suffer through inherited disease. There seems to be a necessity in the formation of character by right motives which forbids righteousness being the pledge of exemption from suffering. If only the sinner was afflicted, the unfortunate would seek salvation from a low motive. If in battle only the evil men met death, there would be a large

number of superficial conversions at the breaking out of war. God did not make disciples of men by telling them that it would be a life of ease and happiness, but rather presented the dark side, and said, "Deny all, and take up your cross." They were to have such a high motive that they would choose right for right's sake, despite all it might cost in suffering. So long as suffering exists in the world, the good as well as the evil must expect it as a part of life. This does not in any way annul the fact that the Christian's sorrow is lessened by a higher joy, nor does it interfere with the assurance of eternal freedom from suffering in the future life.

Suffering is ofttimes a blessing in disguise. Affliction in many cases—like the trailing lashes before the entrance to the tunnel or the bridge—warns us of approaching danger. Better a thousand afflictions than one sin. They work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. "Painful sensations," says Professor Le Conte, "are only watchful vedettes upon the outposts of our organism, to warn us of ap-

proaching danger. Without these the citadel of our life would quickly be surprised and taken." The strong man is strengthened by trial, while the weak man is often made weaker. Rightly used, it becomes the material ladder by which we ascend to a higher plane of Christian experience. The tears of suffering are often the lenses through which we behold the rainbow around the throne, making visible the showers of divine mercy that continually fall. It shuts out the noise of the world so that we can hear the "choir invisible." It burns out the alloy of secret sins and self-sufficiency, and reveals the pure gold of tested character. "The very fact that God makes pain beneficial to the afflicted reveals His beneficent character." The Creator would be unworthy of our devotion if He had no higher aim in man's existence than mere happiness.

Man was not intended to be a private corporation. The self-centered life can never attain to largeness of living. The vicarious element in Christ's life in relation to sinners is reproduced to some degree in that of His

followers. Paul believed in denying self for others and could even wish himself accursed for his brethren's sake. Sin in *others* demands sacrifice of *self for* others. Christ, in speaking of the fulfillment of duty, said, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends."

We have attempted to show by the three kinds of suffering already mentioned that it is not always a direct or even an indirect result of sin. We can only say that in a sinless world penal suffering would have no place. But aside from the beneficial and remedial effects of suffering in this life, there is also a penal element which needs consideration. This is, however, largely incidental. Penalty is the consequence of sin, but it is not always self-inflicted. The very constitution of the moral sphere tends to make the way of the transgressor hard. It is hard because the inner ideal and sense of right and wrong are certain to bring remorse of conscience and because of the external laws and the moral standard of society. All unforgiven sin must inevitably be punished. The sinner

must avail himself of the provided remedy for his wrongness or pay the price of self-induced suffering.

The vital connection existing between suffering and sin is beautifully presented in the Book of Job. The richness of material, the dramatic style, and the sublime purpose combine in making it the masterpiece of all literature. It may be spoken of as a dramatic poem on the religious philosophy of the innocent or an answer to the query, "Why do the righteous suffer?" The chief personage is a man "perfect in character, one who feared God and avoided evil." His great prosperity was taken as an evidence of his piety. Before the council of heaven an adversary appears, questions his piety, and asks permission to test his sincerity. The request is granted, and under Providence the good man is brought to trial.

"The main theme of the book," says Driver, "controverts the theory that all suffering is a sign of divine displeasure and presupposes sin on the part of the sufferer." The old Hebrew conception excluded secon-

dary causes and everything was traced direct to God. He was the Author and Ruler of all things. Great suffering meant great sins. In Job's distress and despondency three friends come to console him. After seven days and seven nights of silent suffering too deep for utterance, Job's bitter anguish finally bursts forth in cursing the day he was born and in a prayer for death.

Eliphaz, "the oldest and most dignified being almost of prophetic rank," reproves the sufferer and asserts God's justice. "They that plow iniquity and sow wickedness reap the same." The innocent and the upright are not cut off. He appeared harsh and unyielding. He had not known any evil in this man, but his suffering was certain proof to him that somewhere there was secret sin. Theory counted for more than fact.

Bildad, who was of a conservative nature, refers to the moral precedents of the past. He would have Job take these afflictions as the judgments of a discriminating God who rewards the good and punishes the evil.

Zophar is a saintly character, with strong personal convictions as to God's goodness. He accuses Job of mockery and undue complaint. To his mind the suffering was less than his iniquity deserved. God's ways are unsearchable and man must not presume to judge the infinite.

Elihu, who thus far has been a silent listener, can no longer remain silent. He severely reproves the three friends for their failure to satisfactorily meet the difficulty, and then accuses Job of attempting to justify himself in the sight of God. Davidson claims that his chief contribution to the problem lies in the stress he places upon affliction as a discipline.

We now come to the beginning of the true solution. Human remedies have all failed. Job is still unsatisfied and clamors for a hearing in the court of heaven. Man's extremity becomes God's opportunity. At the climactic moment God utters His voice out of the whirlwind. "The speech is grand in its silence as to the individual difficulty." It calls on men to get away from self and

contemplate the all-sufficiency of the infinite. The supreme struggle is to understand God, and not to escape suffering. He presents no philosophical theory in explanation of man's suffering. He would dispel the clouds of humanity's misfortune by presenting the brightness of Divinity's glory.

Man must learn that punishment is not always penal, but may be productive of good. That physical suffering and material loss may be spiritual profit and heavenly gain. That humility of self—which we interpret as descent—is ofttimes the mysterious pathway which leads to the mount of vision. We rise above the clouds and storm and get a life-lasting glimpse of the glory which is about to be revealed. There comes a spirit of submission and trust which makes it possible to count all things but loss. Man is so to lay hold on God as to be unmindful of "these light afflictions," and to exclaim in times of most discouraging circumstances, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." The rough and stony road over which we travel with tired and bleeding feet is no

longer the way of the transgressor. Earthly loss becomes heavenly gain. The cloudy vision disappears and he exclaims, with ecstatic confidence:

> "I know that my Redeemer liveth
> And that He shall stand up at last upon the earth;
> And after my skin has thus been destroyed,
> Yet in my flesh shall I see God."

"Behind a frowning Providence he beholds a smiling face." The end is not defeat, but victory. Job's theodicy was faulty, but it welcomes divine correction. The best apology for the value of divine aid in human suffering is to be found in the words: "In all these things Job neither sinned nor judged God foolishly."

His former prosperity is doubled. His scope of Providence is widened. God is justified and man is satisfied. Suffering is no longer to be interpreted as the certain evidence of sin, but to be looked upon as no respecter of persons. The victorious culmination of righteousness over evil is assured. Sin is by permission, and not of divine origin. The complete mystery of evil is yet un-

solved. But over every suffering child faith beholds a tender, loving Father "keeping watch above His own." The night of affliction may come, but the Sun of Righteousness never fails to rise with healing in His wings. Satan has his say now, but the final verdict and triumphant oration is to be of God. Discord is of the present, but divine harmony comes in the future. God is just because God is God, and faith interprets doubt:

> "Blind unbelief is sure to err,
> And scan His work in vain;
> God is His own interpreter
> And He will make it plain."

We have now reached a stage in the doctrine of sin where we are prepared to introduce the question of future punishment. The truth and necessity of penalty for those who persist in rebelling against God is evidenced by the teaching of all religions. Justice demands it, and conscience approves the verdict. Mankind in general entertains a very cheap notion of divine wrath. It would be contrary to His very being to inflict penalty in the sense in which we speak of it in rela-

tion to man. God desires every man to be saved. He has no pleasure in the sin of the disobedient, nor in the death of the wicked. Just rulers dislike to imprison men for life. They are pained when it becomes necessary to execute the criminal. They would like to see every man a good citizen and the state of society to be such as never to necessitate the arrest of a single individual. But crime and disobedience of themselves necessitate judgment. Government must be protected and law upheld. We have no basis for the assertion that future punishment is to be corrective.

The teaching of many would make punishment more potent as a means of regeneration than redemptive love. Christ's atonement becomes an acknowledged failure and needs to be supplemented by "purgatorial redemption," which is assumed to accomplish what divine love could not do. "If punishment renovates, Müller asks whether it is a kindness to exempt any man from it until it has fully accomplished its end. And how is it indeed possible that, if punishment reno-

vates, that its removal, redemption, also renovates? He also states that divine chastisement, as beneficent, in the Scriptures is very distinctly referred only to those who have received the renewing grace of God and have become children by faith in Christ." There must be, then, in all our thinking a marked distinction between what the Bible terms divine chastisement and divine punishment. One is disciplinary, while the other is wholly penal. We must be very superficial statesmen if we find no place for retributive justice, remembering always that suffering is not imputed, but self-originated.

The nation that is just in its punishment of the law-breaker must itself be just. If God were the author of sin, future punishment would be the height of injustice. But since we have previously shown that He is not its author; since man is a free moral agent, and not under necessity; since inherited depravity does not imply guilt or sin; since sin is not an infirmity of the flesh, nor an error of the intellect; since the characteristics of sin free us from unjust demands,

and since every man has both the ability and the opportunity to be saved, eternal punishment becomes the highest expression of justice.

"Fatherhood is not infinite good-nature, oblivious of faults, indulgent to the wrong-doer, and tolerant of wrong. There is something more terrible in the attitude of the father to sin than of the judge to crime, for the judge sees in the crime only an offense against law, but the father feels in sin the ruin of his son. The judge regards the criminal only as a person against whom the law is to be vindicated, but the father regards the son as a person out of whom sin is to be expelled. God can never be reconciled to the being of sin, or be anything else than its supreme enemy."[1] "Even the relation of parent and child," says Dr. Denney, "must be one in which—ethically speaking—some things are forever obligatory, and some things forever impossible; in other words, it must be a relation determined by law, and law which can not deny itself." Men are

[1] Fairbairn, Christ in Mod. Theol., p. 467.

more anxious to escape justice than they are to free themselves from guilt and sin. They are ready to use any accessible analogy they can imagine to exist between the divine and human fact of parentage.

The universal assurance that the Judge of all the earth will do right has lightened the burdens of humanity's weary ones, has ministered to misfortune's millions, has transformed prisons into palaces, has cheered the down-trodden slaves of serfdom, has illumined the dark pathway of affliction, and has given martyr courage to God's unnumbered heroes. We rejoice to know that some day condemned innocence shall be vindicated, persecuted purity shall gain a protector, and earth's injustice find a final judgment seat.

Let us briefly examine the conclusions of J. Edgar Beet in his book entitled "The Last Things." In a study of the Pauline Epistles he states that Paul holds strongly to the notion of punishment being eternal and the ruin final, and that there is no intimation of any future probation. In John's Gos-

pel he discovers nothing additional that can change the Pauline doctrine, aside from some passage which may be interpreted as metaphors. The Synoptics give punishment a more conspicuous place than the preceding. Christ opens the door of the eternal prison, and we hear the wailing of the lost. "Absolute endlessness of punishment" is here strongly emphasized.

In Revelation "actual suffering is even more conspicuous than in the Synoptics" and "ceaseless torment" more emphatically expressed. He sums up the whole matter by saying that "the writers of the New Testament agree in describing, with more or less definiteness, the punishment to be inflicted in the day of Christ's return as final separation from the blessedness of the saved. They give no ground for hope that the agony of the lost will ever cease; but they do not plainly and categorically assert its endless continuance."

The author finally says that the doctrine is not so "decisively" stated as the "primary doctrines." What constitutes a "primary doctrine?" Can we find any doctrine more

strongly emphasized? If the words "eternal," "ceaseless," and "everlasting" mean anything, they leave no doubt of the fact. If we hold to the doctrines of justification by faith, regeneration, and witness of the Spirit, which are presented no more emphatically, then we can see no escape from the doctrine of endless punishment. "No ground for hope of the agony of the lost ever ceasing," comes very near to an admission of proof and leaves very little ground for any assumption to the contrary. After asserting Paul's teaching, he, in a later discussion, says that "in the Epistles of Paul and Peter we have important" teaching about the doom of the lost, implying actual suffering, but no statement or indication of duration. Their silence is very significant.

But we may ask if there is any correlative doctrine that has more passages in its support. The weakest part of the argument is his reference to the irrelevancy of the doctrine with a God of infinite love, followed by the assertion that "no one of us would inflict such a penalty on the vilest offender."[1]

[1] Dr. Beet's "The Last Things," p. 207.

This is a destructive type of rationalism that would measure all God's acts by the dictates of human reason. Would any man dare compare our notion of sin with that which is possessed by a God of absolute holiness and justice? "What *our* moral sense forbids us to do to others we can not conceive that God will do." This is too humanistic to require us to show its deception by referring in detail to God's dealing with men.

Would *our* moral sense have sent the only-begotten Son of God to suffer and die for sinful and rebellious men? There must always exist an infinite difference between the divine and human facts of fatherhood. The child ought not to find fault with the father's treatment, since a more matured experience would withhold present judgment.

If we allow the author to go back to the Old Testament, and even to Homer, for the meaning of New Testament words, then we allow a violation of the laws which govern the development of language, which would destroy the true interpretation of *all* New Testament doctrines. If we translate "aio-

nos'' as meaning ''age-lasting,'' then ''hamartia'' is no longer sin, but merely a reference to marksmanship. We can not believe that when the inspired writers used the word ''eternal'' with its current meaning that they meant less than they said. When Peter spoke of ''eternal glory'' and ''unfading inheritance,'' did he mean what he said, or something else? We all know that there are scores of words in common use to-day that had almost an entirely different meaning even a century ago. The forty passages where Christ and the apostles refer to ''eternal,'' ''everlasting,'' and ''unending'' life as the future reward to the righteous, must have a new interpretation placed upon them. God is no longer infinite and ''eternal.'' His attributes must be accommodated to this ''new eisegesis,'' and He Himself becomes only an age-lasting God.

Is this our ''New Theology'' and our new message to a sin-biased world desiring an excuse for its wickedness? Is this to be our answer to God's rebellious and sin-loving subjects, who through all the centuries have

been seeking an anodyne for the remorse of their guilty consciences? The fires of Gehenna have finally been quenched and in their place we have only the "age-lasting contemplation of past sins." We are not seeking to dogmatize as to the *character* of future punishment—the teaching much of which is figurative, admits of varied interpretations—but as to its *duration* we maintain that its "endlessness" is unmistakably taught throughout the New Testament.

If "eternal" is to become "age-lasting," then God must arbitrarily make the change, and such an act would destroy the attributes of divinity and annul the very essence of sin. "Compulsory restoration," says Principal Fairbairn, in his "Christ in Modern Theology," "is only another form of annihilation. Freedom is of the essence of man, and he must be freely saved to be saved at all. Were he saved at the expense of his freedom, he would be not so much saved as lost. For the very seat and soul of personality is will; and were the will suspended, especially in the article of its supreme choice, the personality

would be destroyed. Sin is not to be vanquished, either by the destruction of the compulsory restoration of the sinner, but by his free salvation; and should this fail of accomplishment, yet God will have been so manifested by the attempt at it that all the universe will feel as if there had come to it a vision of love that made it taste the ecstasy and beatitude of the divine."

The relation of sin to children is largely theoretical. They are objects of special compassion and favor with our Heavenly Father. The plan of salvation can not be rigidly adhered to in reference to them. Its special mission is to the voluntary transgressor. There is an unconditional and immediate benefit which comes to all, but when we speak of redemption from sin we refer especially to those who have reached the age of accountability.

Augustine taught that "unless infants receive the benefits of the sacraments they are manifestly in danger of damnation. But damned they can not be without sin. Now, since they have no sin of their own ('in vita

propria'), it is necessary for us to credit them with original sin, however unintelligible the mystery." This dogmatism was due to his theories of the Church and was capable of making "necessary" anything from damnation of infants to the imputation of sin to the innocent.

The consensus of opinion favors the sinlessness of children. They are guiltless and free from any disfavor on the part of God. Christ welcomes them as models of innocence and possessors of His kingdom. Any doctrine that teaches the damnation of God's little ones is both anti-Scriptural and unreasonable. The child is not under law, but under grace. Knowledge of the law must precede responsible transgression.

The primal effect of sin in the individual was a conscious loss of the divine favor. Personal sin excluded him from Paradise and condemned him as worthy of death. Mercy stayed the execution of the sentence and offered, on condition of pardon, "Paradise regained." The appreciation of the divine purpose in the creation of man will greatly aid

us in understanding our personal relationship to sin. This can not be determined wholly by the present divine attitude. God loves man for what he *might have been,* rather than for what he *is* in his present state. There is a long distance between Eden and Calvary, and a wide distinction between untested innocency in Paradise and voluntary martyrdom for conscience's sake in Rome.

Many hold that Adam was created physically immortal, and that it was the fall that brought physical death to men. This is, however, a disputed decision and remains an open question. When Paul declared that "by one man came death," did he mean physical, spiritual, or both? The whole problem is centered in the word "thanatos," death. Hundreds of volumes have been written in defense of various theories, and yet it remains unsettled.

In passing we would state that there is no certain proof in Genesis that Adam was not primarily mortal and that he would not have experienced death even though he had

not sinned. Death may be unnatural and abnormal under present conditions, but sin has rendered all things unnatural. But would it have seemed so revolting if sin had not entered the race? "The sting of death is sin," and the apostle here undoubtedly means physical death. It seems reasonable to suppose that if sin did not exist, and the sting which results from sin was not present, physical death would not be so abhorrent. The death of a little child has the quietude of restful sleep. We teach that the child is guiltless, and therefore sinless. Then how can we say that the child dies as a result of Adam's sin?

The natural interpretation and most probable meaning of the two statements, "death through Adam," "life through Christ," is that the words "life" and "death" are placed in antithesis. The life which the second Adam brought was not physical immortality, but spiritual life, here and hereafter. Therefore the result of Adam's fall was spiritual, not physical death. This strengthens the teaching of the passage and is as much in harmony with the context as the other.

The result of the fall was not confined to the moral and spiritual part of man. As to his mental endowments and ability to use them in the acquisition of knowledge, primitive man was not biased by evil. *We* come into the world with our intellects affected by sin. The "infallible monitor" which was to aid in the attainment of completeness of knowledge has become fallible. Sin brought upon the race mental as well as moral infirmity. The individual is a unit, and one member can not suffer without impairing in some degree the other parts. Human nature has no water-tight compartments. "The relation of love is severed. Man is out of God, and God is out of man. How distant God has become from man is plain from the fact that He now advances to them from without; and how strange men have become to God is plain from the fact that they hide themselves from His presence."

"To abandon souls He loved, even though they had abandoned Him, would be to punish man's faithlessness by ceasing to be faithful to Himself. Nor could He make man happy

in sin, for here there was a twofold impossibility: first, happiness is not something that can be made—it must be worked from within, earned, that it may be enjoyed; and secondly, His own happiness is moral, and He can create happiness only by means of a moral perfection akin to His own. What became Him, then, was to save man from sin. He so loved the world that He could do no other than will to save it. He so pitied man that to redeem him He could not spare Himself. To say 'God is love' means He must be the Savior.'"[1]

The relation of sin to the individual is so vital to the wholeness of his life that even the memory and imagination, the emotions and the finer sensibilities bear the Edenic taint. Turning to the heart—the center of the affections—we find it described as "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." "All the imaginations of the heart are evil, and that continually." Out of the heart are the issues of all vice and corruption. The very fountain of human life has

[1] Christ in Mod. Theol.—Fairbairn, p. 465.

been rendered impure. The will, which is the arbiter of man's destiny, has an hereditary bias in favor of sin, which adds to the intensity of the struggle against good. The motivity of the good has been lessened. But the "sin-blinded eye, the deafened ear, the hardened heart, and the corrupted nature" are not sufficient to enslave the human will. The weight of man's own personality—plus the atoning gift—remain sufficient to overbalance them all, if the will so decides. The field of motive choice has changed in the wicked man's life, but he is still conscious of the power of elective volition, however deficient he may be in executive volition.

The fact of sin is vitally related to the atonement. Sin is of man, but salvation is of God. The cross not only expresses God's hatred of sin, but it represents the final effort of the sinner. Innocence had been condemned at the hands of the guilty. They had dragged His bruised and bleeding body up the rocky steeps of Calvary, nailed it to the cross, and pressed down upon His brow the crown of thorns. Heaven dropped her cur-

tains to darken the scene. The temporal victory of sin is to result in its eternal defeat. Innocence will be vindicated and truth shall have her resurrection morn. Man's verdict was defeat, but God saw in it a splendid victory. The cross was not the final surrender, but the beginning of a triumphal march. It was to be the banner of God's army in the warfare against sin. Because Christ conquered, His followers will conquer. Dr. Denney, in his recent volume, "The Atonement and the Modern Mind," states "that if the atonement is anything it is everything. It is the most profound of all truths, and the most recreative. It determines more than anything else our conceptions of God, of man, of history, and even of nature. For those who recognize it at all it is Christianity in brief; it concentrates in itself all that the wisdom, power, and love of God mean in relation to sinful men." Were we asked to inscribe on the cross some message it has brought to us, on one side we would write, GOD SO LOVED, and on the other, THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH.

We stated in the beginning that the divine aim in the creation of man as a free moral agent was that He might develop a race of holy men. Adam was the primal parental head of the race, but his fall interfered with its possible solidarity. Through the genetic relations of the first pair to their offspring a depraved nature was transmitted. This fact considered in connection with human freedom made it impossible to effect a reconstruction except by means of an atonement, which would meet "original depravity with original grace." This done, every man is made equally responsible with Adam. He is also brought into a conditional relation with the new head of the race. Adam forfeited his right of the headship of the race and all men mysteriously received an inborn tendency to sin; Christ, being without sin, became the "new head" of the race. Henceforth new life was to pulsate in the spiritual veins of every member of the new race.

Incarnation was necessary to redemption. Sin had not only alienated man from God, but it had power to destroy the alien. The

fact that Christ became human in the sense that He took upon Himself our nature, destroys the false theory of substitution. He is now the living head of the new spiritual race. His death availed for my guilt and penalty because I now live in Him and He in me. The incarnation effected the "at-one-ment" of the finite and the infinite and made His blood effectual for human redemption. That the incarnation was necessary to reveal God's love to man is based on the false assumption that it had not previously been revealed.

We more correctly denominate it as another phase of that divine love which had for centuries been known to Israel. There may be as much love in the father's chastening of the child as there is in the service and sacrifice of daily ministry. The incarnation certainly had a deeper content than revelation. It was the power which was capable of effecting the at-one-ment of the Father and estranged child. The method of its attainment was by the earth-touch of the heaven-life made possible by the human incarnation

of the Divine Son. This was the tragedy of the centuries and the divine mystery of the ages. If we take the familiar example of the prodigal and "the certain man," the hindrance is not in the unknown love of the Father, but in the disobedience of the son. Sin had erected a barrier between the known love of the Father and the heart of a rebellious son. The seat of the difficulty is in the heart of the prodigal, and a divine power is needed that will cause this sin-citizen of the far country to come to self-realization and be willing to journey home and accept the waiting pardon of a constantly-known love.

Christ did not bear my sins altogether because He was divine, nor did He simply die in my stead as a merciful God or as a compassionate angel. He did not loose us from our sins by an isolated sacrifice which was sufficient to propitiate an offended God, or to portray the love of our Heavenly Father so that it might furnish a *moral influence motive* in favor of our return. He did not simply offer satisfaction for our offenses, nor did He die in support of the moral gov-

ernment of God. He did *all this,* and He did infinitely more. He became flesh and dwelt among us. The pulsations of *human* life became a part of divine life. He was weary and heavy laden, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. He experienced hunger and loneliness. In His own body He bore our pain and penalty. His was not the sacrifice of an angel or an inhabitant of another world, dying for the sins of men with whom He had no vital connection. He entered into our real life and drank the "bitter cup" for you and for me.

Men can not consistently object to the divine method of redemption. Christ is the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world, which taketh away the sin of the world. "Gethsemane and Calvary became concrete presentations of age-long facts: the fact on the one hand that holiness must punish sin; and the fact on the other hand that He who gave His life to man at the beginning must share man's guilt and penalty." Some say that it was possible for Christ to atone for the sin of the world because He was without

sin; others say that it was due to His divinity, and still others claim that it was from the fact of His connection in the Godhead. All these and many other elements entered into the atoning work, but the one which justifies God and renders it effective from the human side is His vital connection and *union* with us as well as with the Father.

"Christ, because of what He was as the Divine Son of God, was capable of communicating between the finite and infinite. Were He cut off from God, He could be no source of life. Were He cut off from man, He would be no normal or natural and, therefore, no universal medium of distribution. The doctrine of the incarnation is the theory which, by the union or coexistence of the two natures in His person, explains His sufficiency for His functions as Mediator and Savior."[1] It is the one fact that throws light on His earthly life, the agony in Gethsemane, the hesitation at death, and His vicarious suffering on the cross.

According to Dr. Curtis the real problem

[1] Fairbairn, Christ in Mod. Theol., p. 471.

of redemption from sin has two phases: the *personal side,* which has to do with the making of holy men, and the *racial side,* which is concerned with the brotherhood or solidarity of the race. The new race is to consist not in a number of individual holy men, but is to be a holy race. Some will choose to sin and continue to rebel against God, and they will finally be isolated from the race. We can readily see that, while this new race-center makes it possible for *all* to come in, yet it will not include the complete race as it might have done had Adam not sinned.

The introduction of sin into the world has made it necessary for God to effect certain things for those who, without any guilt on their part, come into the world with an inherited tendency to evil. Christ not only meets this, but He provides for future obstacles which hinder man in his return to God. He becomes the incarnation of the moral Ruler. All justice and judgment center in Him. He takes the place of the sin-biased conscience. It is not too much to say "Christ is my conscience." The moral law

is not done away, but it is exalted, and we find in Christ our present standard. He takes care of our peace with the past and our assurance of the present. We walk with Him day by day, and He becomes to us "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." The fascination of sin is broken, not by His suffering and death, but by the presence and power of His Holy Spirit. His influence upon the conscience produces a hunger for the higher life, and we voluntarily forsake the old and accept the new life.

We have, as a result of the atonement, a new race made out of the old one, with Christ as the Second Adam. Man is redeemed and God is justified. The rebellious sinner of his own free choice is cut off from the race. The Christian lives in union with Christ here, and in the life to come attains His likeness. The moral law is upheld, the total nature of God is satisfied, and there is a way made *possible* for the salvation of every sinner.

XIII

THE FACT IN CONCLUSION

"Assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."
—Milton.

"The acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by the reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it,
And has so far advanced thee to be wise."
—Browning.

"No argument that attempts to justify the ways of God to men can afford to forget the full measure and duration of God's relation to man. Time and eternity are one; he who is and he who is to be are one and the same person; and his life, its meaning, purpose, discipline, can never be understood if he be regarded as a mere mortal being, with no existence save what begins with birth and ends with death. What to a mortal might well seem unmitigated evil may appear to the immortal only a discipline the better qualifying him for his immortality."
—Principal A. M. Fairbairn.

THE CONCLUSION

The construction of a theodicy which would be able to satisfy the demands of pure reason is as yet unattained. The proof of this statement is found in the history of science and philosophy. "Philosophy," says Dr. Watson, "has been distinguished for its strenuous treatment of the moral problem, but it has been visibly hampered by circumstances, being in the position of a Court which can not go into the whole case. If sin were only a defect in thought, then philosophy could treat the case; but when we enter the realm of the spiritual it is logically impaired." This limitation, however, does not apply to real Christian philosophy, since some of the strongest defenders of the faith have been numbered among the consecrated scholars who have bequeathed to humanity their philosophical interpretations of religion.

But the Christian may still hope to find a solution of the problem, despite the failure of the rationalist. The divine kingdom and King have their own laws of interpretation, which are open only to those who live the life of the Spirit. "The divine government," says Van Oosterzee, "remains a difficulty to us until we go into the sanctuary of God." Theology welcomes scholarship with all her wisdom, but when reason has reached the ultimate limits of research, then faith must come in to complete the solution. Through the agency of the heart and the intellect, by which we combine the spiritual and the natural, we are able both to satisfy conscience and ratify reason. The Christian begins at the foundation of the moral system with the *plan* and *purpose* of God.

The *purpose* was a race of holy men. Mankind will become united under Christ as the new head of the race. The final outcome of this purpose must be in harmony with the infinite goodness of God, and be expressive of his total character. "God's purpose is the same in redemption that it was in crea-

tion. The first plan, the ideal plan, failed because of sin; but this failure is now, in redemption, to be made over into a triumph. Out of the Adamic race, broken in organism and doomed to destruction as a race, the work of Christ is to secure a new race completely personal, completely organic, and completely holy."

The purpose presented is worthy the character of the Creator. We feel certain that it is possible for individuals, even in *this* life, to gain such a vision of the value of character formed under freedom as to approve the Infinite. As finite creatures we shall only know in part concerning the wisdom of the present moral systems, but that *part* may become so convincing as to carry the whole man with it in favor of God. Moral character, even in the life that now is, is instinctively recognized as the richest heritage of earth. It is central to every other attainment and made the crowning attribute of personality.

The *plan* of God has already been stated as that in which human sovereignty was

granted to man. It is man under freedom. We were placed under Divine Providence and in a world where every call of life was toward the good and every warning was against the evil. The protection of every phase of our physical and mental well-being was carefully guarded. We were the crowning workmanship of creation, made a little less than God. Yet, to fulfill this purpose, the plan must admit of "contrary choice." The moral agent must be a probationer and meet the test of obedience. Viewed from the divine side, sin was merely a "possibility" contingent on voluntary choice, while on the human side sin might become an actuality if the individual determined to betray his trust.

The philosopher is compelled to admit that the world in which we live is not only the *best* possible, but the *only* possible one that could fulfill the ideal of the Infinite Father which was inherent in the self-expression of His creative love. That the Absolute had the authority and right to put into execution His own plan, there can be no denial,

and that He was morally justified in so doing may be concluded from the fact that no other plan was possible even to Omniscient Omnipotence. There could be no high purpose in divine creation unless the *created* was made in the likeness and image of the Creator. It is certain that we could not have been like our Father if we had been mere forms of human mechanism or some species of animal governed by blind instinct. We were made like God in that we are free moral agents. We may act like God if we choose the good and refuse the evil.

We must all agree that moral character is the result of free choice, and can not be created even by Omnipotence. It was possible to have had a race of divinely necessitated beings, but their lack of freedom would have made void responsibility, which is an absolute essential to the formation of character. The Creator's self-limitation, resulting from the grant of human sovereignty, was a perfectly voluntary act and in no way interfered with His omnipotence. When persons ask why individuals were allowed this

freedom to sin, the answer given is found in the statement that, while sin was not essential *to* nor a part *of* the divine intention, still the "possibility" of an evil choice was necessary to the formation of a system in which moral character might become a reality.

The thought presented in the following paragraph may prove helpful to some as a reason for the wisdom of the plan. "If it was good for God," says Dr. Fairbairn, "to create those who could share His own beatitude, He could do so only on the condition that He made them capable of rejecting that for which they were designed. There is no man with an honorable manhood within him who is not enlarged and ennobled by both the idea and the fact of fatherhood; but every man who wills to become a father faces the problem which God faced when He made the universe. In the home and in the family the father is disciplined by the child as much as the child is disciplined by the father, but to the father belongs the responsibility of the child's being, and on him lie duties of self-restraint, of providence, of the daily concern

to make all things which happen bear upon the formation of the higher moral qualities of the child. May we not say, then, that what justifies the responsibilities man dares to undertake when he becomes a parent justifies God in making a universe which shall be the home of reason, vocal with the harmonies of love and the dissonances of life?"

The higher our conception of God and man, the more difficult becomes the solution of our problem, and yet it is only on this plane that we can be true to the Christian ideal. The denial of the infinite and the depreciation of the finite may annul, but they do not explain the mystery of evil. It is comparatively easy to justify the action of a State official, owing to the fact that the whole scope of the plan is before us. But when we come to construct a theodicy we find ourselves dealing with persons and precepts that have to do not only with time, but eternity. Our life experience, even when enriched by all the centuries of known history, comprises only a small segment of the arc of the past, though we entirely exclude the future.

The Divine Father deals with life in its completeness. With Him there is no past or future. He has made no promise nor pledge that we should fully understand His action toward us in this life. The purpose and plan are eternal, but their realization belongs to time and is yet in process of development.

We are apt to forget, when we consider the fact of sin, that we are dealing with a divine problem. Demands are made which would be applicable to a human government, but they are quite out of harmony with a divine one. It is very truthfully stated that "we must not assume that God's moral relations to men and to the sins of men are identical with our own, and that, therefore, what is right for us to do must be right for Him to do, and that what would be wrong for us to do, would be wrong for Him to do." This kind of superficial speculation is based on a false conception of Fatherhood. The practice is far too common of constructing conclusions in theology from shallow analogies drawn between God and man.

The complete scope of the divine plan in its relation to human freedom and the consequent actuality of evil has not yet been known nor revealed. We must still walk in part by faith, but not without the basic knowledge of centuries of providential history which evidence the profound proofs of not only an omniscient, but an infinitely holy God. We can not but trust the future because of the past. The seen becomes the ground for our faith in the unseen. The matchless wisdom of the major part of the plan precludes our rejection of the minor portion. Our approval of "the revealed" ought to delay our criticism of the "unrevealed." Are we keeping to the universal verdict of experience when we assert that our difficulties regarding the harmony of the existence of evil and the goodness of God belong not to the known plan, but to the unknown purpose? Are we too credulous and not sufficiently true to the just rights of reason when we plead for delay in the criticism of the unfinished plan and as yet unfulfilled purpose? If we have been, then we can not

expect that our reasoning will be convincing; but if we can agree as to the rights of divinity in their relation to those of the individual, then we may still hope that our message has proven of value.

We can not think it an insult to reason to admit that "a complete theodicy is not yet possible on account of the wide difference between God's exaltedness and our insignificance, God's wisdom and our short-sightedness, God's infiniteness and our transitoriness. At best we can observe something of the *what,* much less of the *how,* and least of all of the *wherefore* of the divine activity. Nor is this necessary, either for the honor of God, or for the edification of our neighbor, or for our own essential well-being. The mysterious element of the divine government on its part curbs the pride of man, calls forth faith with its precious fruits, and justifies the hope which awakens in the promised revelation of the future."

We are quite willing to assent to the statement of Martensen that "the *true* theodicy must be undertaken from the standpoint of

Christianity, and that the *complete* theodicy can only be given with the completed history of the world." That it would be impossible for us to grasp the complete content of the Infinite's plan and purpose will be readily admitted, and that fact, which in no sense can be designated a fault of the Absolute, calls for the patience of faith and a recognition of the limitations of human reason. The solution of the problem of evil from the standpoint of reason and experience can not be consistently expected. The mind of the Master is the best preparation for an approach to this enigma and an acceptance of the rightful authority of Christian faith.

The rationalist ignores faith as unscientific and deals with spiritual verities about as the miller deals with grain. He forgets that he is dealing with questions which have eternal relations as well as present-day applications. Every act of moral freedom has an inner power and purpose, just as every seed has a latent life that demands respect not only for what it is, but for what it may

be, when Faith has planted it, Time developed it, and Reason reaped its harvest.

The shallow apology for a life of conscious sinfulness is often concealed in the query, "Why did God create me with the possibility of sin?" This is a phase of self-justification which implies an accusation against the Divine Being who permits sin. There is no appreciation in it of the plan and purpose of the All-wise Creator. The *possibility* of moral obedience is inseparably united with the *possibility* of immoral disobedience. To establish the relationship of father and son demands much more than the great majority are capable of comprehending. We play with words and use terms that are largely meaningless. It is essential that we possess that humility which precedes teachableness, if we are to know God and His purposes.

Sin can never have any real meaning to us unless we have a true conception of divine holiness and a clear appreciation of what the Father is seeking to do for the individual and for the race. We must get a

vision of Him that will lift us out of our narrow thought and our limited environment and cause us by the clear eye of faith to behold a new heaven and a new earth. This must live before us as the divinest of all realities. It must be a power that grips us and of which we may say "in it we live and move and have our being."

There can be no thought of arbitrary law or of unjust requirement in a system that insists on obedience to certain precepts that are an inherent part of the organism itself. The divine law of interpretation is stated in the words of the apostle, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." We are asking no more than is demanded *by* the law of natural science, when we call for obedience to the laws of the spiritual kingdom. It is an unalterable principle in mechanics that obedience to the laws of the force must precede results. The kingdom of electricity is no less dogmatic in its demands than the king-

dom of spiritual revelation. Truths which belong to the higher realm of Spirit and faith can not consistently be made wholly amenable to the demands of human reason. The tests of mathematical science are not the tests of Christian experience. Love transcends logic as faith does reason.

We have no cause to fear that the divine grant of freedom to man will ultimately frustrate the plan and purpose of the Infinite. "The evil," says one, "bears in its own bosom the seeds of disunion and dissolution, and finds to this extent alike its curb and its corrective in itself. The good, on the other hand, has in itself a principle of life and incorruptibility, and comes to the desired development through its very conflict with evil." Thus the world, under the guidance of Omniscience, will culminate in the triumph not of the evil, but of the divinely good. This does not annul the possibility of the eternal rebellion of the sinner, but confirms the ultimate victory of truth and the subserviency of error. "The evil has its time; the good time and eternity before, since God and the good are one."

The truth of the above statement is easily observed in the experience of history. Sin in time works out its own defeat by the very laws of the eternal and abiding. The message of the gospel as it is preached and lived hastens the triumph of the good and precludes a part of the penalty of national and social prodigality. This beneficent and self-guarding government of God is so managed that the glory of individual freedom is not in any degree diminished. Moral freedom is the liberty of law. Divinity is ever over humanity—not in the sense of interference with the small things to the detriment of the great, or the triumph of the temporal to the retarding of the eternal, but in that larger wisdom of Him who knows the end from the beginning and whose plans we are permitted to know only in part.

An attempted explanation of the method by which God is able to conserve human freedom, and at the same time insure the perpetuity of His kingdom, is found in the fact that "when an individual experiences anything, be it pleasant or unpleasant, he is

usually passive; where, on the other hand, when he effects something, he shows himself acting just as he chooses." In his active life we find man a free moral agent, and it is here that character gains its moral value. In his passive moments a divinity shapes the rough-hewn life, and in accord with the mystery of Omniscience all things are made to work out good.

The deeds of men "which are either willed or permitted by God may still be regarded as a part of His adorable plan. The natural evil, that of suffering, and the spiritual evil, that of sin, both take place under God's control, and the history of mankind becomes alike the work and ministry of His providence, without the freedom of the individual man being thereby annihilated."

We shall find a further help in our study of the problem of evil if we view it in the three phases of the general plan and as related to the fulfillment of the divine purpose. "According to the eternal purpose" is the final court of appeal for reason as well as faith. This conception of life finds its origin

in revelation, but it is authenticated in history and experience. A right attitude toward God must precede a correct understanding of man. The depreciation of present or primitive man is certain to lower our conception of his Creator. To assert that God made man a sinner is to deny the very attributes of His being, but to know that He created man moral and free is a justification of His goodness and wisdom. The fact of a holy Father and a sinless Son is a sufficient guarantee of the purity of primitive man and of the redemption of a fallen race.

We may follow the outline suggested by Milton and designate our first picture "Paradise." The environment was Edenic and the ancestors innocent. The entire scene was designed and drawn by the Master Artist, who paints no imperfect pictures. It was not heaven, but man's ideal earthly home. It was natural life without any of the abnormal effects of sin. The fact that it was as the Creator made it gave it the vision of purity and the peace and joy of innocence. There was no guilt because there had as yet been

no transgression. There was no effort to hide from the good because there had been no experience of the evil. It satisfies the demand of faith that the work of the Father—although not perfect in the sense of *developed* character—was perfect in its freedom from sin. The goodness of God is thereby justified in Creation as well as in Redemption. The assertion of the naturalist, that it is more in harmony with present methods of growth to consider man an evolution than a direct creation, carries with it the *assumption* that God either *did* not or *could* not make man as the Scripture of Truth records. So long as we do not care to supplant divine miracles by human hypotheses we are quite satisfied to accept the first picture as the author of Genesis describes it.

The second picture we would present is called "Paradise Lost." It is not wholly new. It is the first one marred and disfigured by the abuse of human freedom. It is not perfect, since it is not the work of the Father. We can not say that it is an evolution or an improvement of the first. There

is more experience portrayed in the dark lines, but it is clouded by the shadows of guilt and sin. Man is the despoiler, and he has always retained the consciousness of his betrayed trust. This is the scene that is most difficult to understand. It is here that the critics of all the centuries have stood. The philosopher and scientist have both been baffled in their attempted explanations. Many have failed to properly distinguish between the first and second, while others, having observed certain incidental analogies, have sought to combine the two by a denial of the first. Those who advocate the latter theory only eliminate the minor difficulties while they multiply the major portion of the problem.

We may say this, as is said of the mutilating of the masterpiece of Leonardo da Vinci at Milan, it was the work of an adversary. The true Artist painted the original, but the present discolored and marred canvas, which contains but few of the marks of the original Genius, must be traced to another hand and heart. It is from the dis-

figured original that all the imperfect copies have been sketched. The world has not taken the time nor the care to look deep enough to discover the outline of the obscured picture. The critics have been too superficial and their conclusions have been false to the real facts. They have come with self-constructed theories, which have determined their viewpoints and biased their conclusions. We would not deny the reality of any part of the awful tragedy of sin, but we insist that a proper study of all the details will furnish a basis for a sound philosophy of faith in the guilt of man and the goodness of God.

The third picture is that which we are pleased to call "Paradise Regained." To the unbelieving and indifferent it is the same scene as the second. To the evolutionist it is only an "unrealized hope," which in some far distant age may gain realization. To many it is little more than the scene of a losing battle against an ever active enemy. To others the "very possibility" of the picture is a sufficient excuse for disbelief and denial. We may state that the meaning of

the scene will depend very largely on our attitude of mind and heart. Faith must come in to supplement reason, here as elsewhere, not because reason is not accounted reliable, but because it is not sufficient unto itself and needs a higher source of knowledge to assist in the complete interpretation.

If we are to escape pessimism at the unfolding of so much of vice and criminality, we shall need to recognize the eternal gain of human sovereignty to those who use it properly, as well as the eternal loss to those who through all the years of entrusted probation continue to betray the Father's grant. To this we may add the promised power of Him who brings redemption and whose very existence is the pledge of sin's defeat and "the burial hour of crime." We shall also need the purified vision that will enable us to behold again the Master Artist with one last bold stroke of love, so applying the blood of Calvary's cross to the second picture as to cover every part of the enemy's work and making the crimson and scarlet stains to become as white as wool and as pure as snow.

Shall we not hang these three pictures in the temple of our faith? The first we may designate "Man in the Image of His Creator;" the second, "The Trust of Human Sovereignty Betrayed;" the third, "Divine Redemption, or Paradise Regained." We shall find that the pre-eminence of Christ in daily experience will become the completing complement of our partially answered "why?" We shall bring the two pictures into such perfect stereoscopic harmony as to find in them our theodicy for the now-existing second. Faith is our highest attitude of reason and we wait on wisdom and endure as seeing Him who is invisible. The Unseen becomes not only the life and *soul* of the seen, but the clear Interpreter of both.

233.2
St 89

Stroup, N. W.

The fact of sin

233.2
St 89